## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 694 24 HE 002 864

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Nash, George; Waldorf, Dan |
| TITLE | The University and the City. Final Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. |
| BUREAU NO | BR-8-0798 |
| PUB DATE | [71] |
| CONTRACT | OEC-3-9-080798-0024(010) |
| NOTE | 300p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *City Problems; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Higher Education; Urban Areas; *Urban Education; *Urban Universities |

ABSTRACT

This study presents case studies that focus in depth on what 9 diverse institutions of higher education have done about urban problems that exist in their areas. Specifically, each of the institutions selected for inclusion in the report is doing an outstanding job in one or several areas of urban, community and minority education, research or service. In addition, the administration of each institution has made a firm commitment to the urban crisis. Criteria for the final selection of the samples were the representativeness of institutions in terms of size, geography, type of control and academic level. The institutions represented are the University of California at Los Angeles; the University of Chicago; Columbia University, New York; Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland; City University of New York; Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts; Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio, Texas; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; and Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan. (Author/HS)

ED 059694

BR-8-0798
PA 24

HE

BSSR

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

ED 059694

# THE UNIVERSITY AND THE CITY

Contract #OEC 3-9-080798-0024(010)

Final Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

George Nash

and

Dan Waldorf

HE002 864

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The administrative details of the study and much of the data-gathering field work were done by Ann Finkelstein of the Bureau of Social Science Research. Other BSSR staff members who made useful suggestions were the Director, Robert T. Bower, Albert Gollin, Helen Astin and Mary De Carlo. At several of the institutions, campus coordinators were appointed to help gather material and arrange interviews and we are indebted to them.

Four of the case studies are authored by Dan Waldorf and Robert Price who worked with me previously at the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University in my earlier research in the area of the university and the city which dates back to 1966. Dr. Tongsoo Song monitored the project for the U. S. Office of Education.

George Nash

* * * * * * *

Drafts of the individual case studies in this report have been sent to the institutions for comment and review for factual error. The Study Director appreciates the assistance and attention given to the study by various college and university officials but assumes for himself full responsibility for the methodology, evaluations and conclusions of each study. The views of the authors are not necessarily those of the U. S. Office of Education.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . i

Chapter

I. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES: PROGRESS DESPITE TRAVIAL by George Nash. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

II. THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO AND THE WOODLAWN COMMUNITY by George Nash . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 31

III. COLUMBIA: TURNING THE UNIVERSITY AROUND by Robert Price. . 66

IV. MORGAN STATE: DEDICATED TO EXCELLENCE AND LEADERSHIP by George Nash . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 111

V. CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK: OPENING THE DOORS by Robert Price . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 129

VI. NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY: A PRIVATE UNIVERSITY SERVING THE URBAN PROLETARIAT by Dan Waldorf. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 168

VII. OUR LADY OF THE LAKE: A DIFFERENT TYPE OF SERVICE by George Nash . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 192

VIII. SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY: GROWTH THROUGH SERVICE by George Nash . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 232

IX. WAYNE STATE: THE URBAN UNIVERSITY by Dan Waldorf . . . . . 257

# INTRODUCTION

This study focuses in depth on what nine diverse institutions of higher education have done about urban problems which exist at their doorsteps. Specifically, each of the institutions which we selected for inclusion in our report is doing an outstanding job in one or several areas of urban, community and minority education, research or service. In addition, the Administration of each institution has made a firm commitment to the urban crisis. Criteria for the final selection of our sample were the representativeness of institutions in terms of size, geography, type of control and academic level.

In the early fall of 1969, the presidents of each college or university selected agreed by letter to cooperate with the study. We began our research by gathering from each campus all available documentary materials which described the histories and substances of programs related to our research interests, as well as administrative structures impinging on institutional involvement in urban affairs.

Our field visits, whose duration and number depended on the size and complexity of each institution, were conducted during the fall and winter of 1969--70. Open ended interviews--individual and group--were our principal data collection instrument. At every campus, we talked at length to administrators, students, faculty and community leaders who were connected with the institution's urban program or who were sensitive to its evolution and substance.

We concentrated on each institution's history and administrative and leadership arrangements through which it related to the urban scene, and on its functions in four areas: as an educator (in the very broad sense of providing mechanisms for the urban disadvantaged to perform their various social roles better): as a citizen and neighbor, as a provider of services and, lastly, as a model or example. This last role parallels the overall purpose of our study which is to provide useful and illustrative information to institutions wanting to become heavily involved in urban, community and minority group problems.

Originally, we intended to inventory and describe everything that each college or university was doing to perform these roles; however, as our field work progressed, we found that urban programs varied from institution to institution in history, content and organization and we decided to describe nine separate and individually unique stories. Our focus is on how things got done rather than on why because we think that this approach is most useful to practitioners looking for ways in which an institution of higher education can implement a felt commitment to its urban environment.

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES:
# PROGRESS DESPITE TRAVAIL

George Nash

Its luxurious, country club type setting in the posh Los Angeles suburb of Westwood makes it unlikely that the University of California, Los Angeles would be a university deeply involved in urban, minority group and community affairs. But as an educator of a diversity of ethnic groups, UCLA has been a pioneer. UCLA's involvement has been more centrally administered and supported from the top and has followed a straighter line of progression than has been the case at most colleges and universities. Despite high level administrative commitment, UCLA's programs have run into a series of road blocks and barriers that would have unsettled any college administration and caused the more faint hearted to abandon their plans. The UCLA administration has, however, weathered a number of early storms, changed the specifics of most of its programs without abandoning its original goals, and has developed a number of sound programs which should be long lived.

This chapter will concentrate on just two of the many elements of UCLA's urban involvement because the programs are fairly unusual and because each had to be changed considerably during the early, troublesome developmental phases. The topics that will be covered in this chapter are the Ethnic Centers' Programs and their antecedents, the Special Education Programs.

Special Education Programs, beginning with the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) started bringing in minority group students, most of whom were black. The original students pushed for expansion of these programs so that UCLA now offers a whole series of programs aimed at four ethnic groups and these students played a leading role in formulating the idea of the four ethnic centers: Afro-American

(Black), Chicano (Mexican-American), Native American (American Indian) and Asian American, which are all now operating.

## The Chancellor's Task Force

In May of 1968, the new President of the University of California, Charles Hitch, presented a special report to the Regents of the University entitled "What We Must Do: The University and The Urban Crisis." He cited the need for "a concerted effort by the University to become viably involved in the present urban crisis, as a means of ameliorating the tenacious malaise that grips our nation." Recognizing the natural ties between educational enlightenment and progressive community action, the report clearly defined the University's role in the solution. The dissemination of relevant research conducted by the University, the involvement of the various University of California campus communities in surrounding urban areas, and the reorganization of the state educational system to improve access to higher education by minority group students, were all integral parts of the redefined role that the University of California was called upon to play in urban communities.

Chancellor Charles Young of UCLA responded by appointing a steering committee to study the matter over the summer of 1968 and propose solutions. The steering committee was chaired by an extremely capable black assistant of Chancellor Young's, C. Z. Wilson. Wilson assumed a key leadership position in coordinating UCLA's attack on urban problems at that point, and has continued this as his major area of responsibility ever since. He is now the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Programs and his role is one of planner and catalyst rather than having administrative responsibility for the operation of the programs. Others on the steering committee included the Chairman of the Academic Senate, the Chairman of the Budget Committee, the Chairman of the Committee on Education Policy, the Vice-Chancellor--Educational Planning, and student representatives from United Mexican-American Students, the Black Students Union, and student legislative councils.

The Steering Committee divided itself into three taskforces, each under student chairmanship, with membership extending beyond that of the Steering Committee and representing all segments of the campus community, with heavy student participation. The three taskforces worked all summer and came up with a variety of documented proposals. The three units were: the Taskforce on Student Entry, the Curriculum Development Taskforce, and the Urban Research and Action Taskforce.

The majority of the proposals that the Steering Committee made were adopted and have provided the framework and outline of what has been done subsequently. One reason that the Taskforce was able to accomplish so much was that UCLA had already made a substantial beginning at involvement with urban, community, and minority group problems. The Taskforce on Student Entry acknowledged the progress of the existing opportunity programs for minority group students at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and proposed a series of new programs, the most important of which was the High Potential Program (Hi-Pot). The most impressive aspect of the Taskforce was the constructiveness and creativeness of the students involved, most of whom were thinking about important policy decisions for the first time in their lives. Rosalio Munoz, in an introduction to the proposals of the Taskforce on Student Entry, wrote the following which goes a long way toward summarizing the spirit of the whole endeavor:

To reiterate in conclusion some of the basic assumptions of the entire package, in this order:

1. Keep the faith, baby.
2. Self-selection by the individual student.
3. Final evaluation based on University standards of achievement.
4. Back Door No More.
5. More Now.
6. The Time Has Come Today.
7. And finally, at once the most subtle and obvious is the fact that Educational Opportunities Program's success is finally bringing in a large enough population of talented and experienced minority students for the beginnings of a cultural ambiance which provides for a more stable emotional adjustment to the University, in both formal and informal contexts. A ready pool of human resources is now at hand to significantly contribute in the University's efforts across the board.

The variety of special education programs at UCLA, some of which were in existence prior to the Chancellor's Taskforce, had by the fall of 1969, increased UCLA's undergraduate minority group enrollment to 19%. Graduate minority enrollment reached 14%. Total graduate and undergraduate enrollment of black students by the fall of 1968, was 1280. There were also 940 Mexican-Americans and 180 American Indians. These three figures were all among the highest totals for any institution of higher education anywhere in the United States as of that date. The largest minority group at UCLA, however, totaling 2,300 students or 8% of the total, were Oriental-American.

### ETHNIC SURVEY-FALL 1969
(excluding Foreign visiting students)

| | Undergraduate | | Graduate | | Totals | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| American Indian | 130 | 0.7 | 50 | 0.6 | 180 | 0.7 |
| Black or Afro-American | 830 | 4.3 | 450 | 4.8 | 1,280 | 4.4 |
| Oriental-American | 1,830 | 9.4 | 470 | 5.1 | 2,300 | 8.0 |
| Mexican American | 710 | 3.6 | 230 | 2.5 | 940 | 3.3 |
| Other Spanish American | 180 | 0.9 | 80 | 0.9 | 260 | 0.9 |
| Other Caucasian | 15,700 | 81.0 | 8,000 | 85.7 | 23,700 | 82.5 |
| Others | 20 | 0.1 | 40 | 0.4 | 60 | 0.2 |
| Totals | 19,400 | 100.0 | 9,320 | 100.0 | 28,720 | 100.0 |

Let us now examine the highlights of each of the special education programs at UCLA. An attempt was made to centralize the administration of all the undergraduate programs under the Director of Special Education Programs. After considering the highlights of each of the programs, we will examine the problems of administration.

The Educational Opportunities Program (EOP)

The UCLA EOP program was established in Fall, 1964, by Chancellor Franklin Murphy and headed at the outset by Anne Allen. UCLA's 33 students were the first in a program that by the academic year 1969-70, had spread to the entire California system of higher education. By that year, there were 5,300 (4,200 being undergraduates) enrolled in the University of California's EOP system, and another 3,150 students in the state college system. The community college EOP program was to begin operation in the academic year 1970-71. UCLA claims that its EOP program was the first major program in the United States assisting students of Mexican-American descent. The largest EOP program by the academic year 1969-70 was UCLA's with 1500 students.

There have been two evaluations of the EOP program: one by Weiler and Rogers of System Development Corporation, which focuses only on the

UCLA program and was published in 1969, and one by Kitano and Miller of Scientific Analysis Corporation, of the entire EOP program on all California campuses, published in the spring of 1970. Each concluded that EOP students had done as well or better than regularly admitted California freshmen. Each, however, was critical of the EOP program for skimming off the cream (or the best) of disadvantaged and minority group students. (The "new breed" of students seems to prefer the term "new student" to disadvantaged.)

To understand the functioning of the EOP program, one has to consider the California state-wide plan for higher education, to which all the individual campuses in the system must adhere, but which has been under considerable attack. It is a stratification system with the nine branches of the University of California getting most of the best students, the state college system getting the next best students, and the community colleges getting the residue. Not only do the three types of institutions vary on the basis of the quality of their student bodies, but they also rank differentially on per capita allocation, proportion of students living on campus, quality of the faculty, and the drop-out rate. Every high school graduate is assured the opportunity to pursue post-secondary education, but the opportunities presented to those who do better in high school are much greater. To introduce some flexibility into the system, the Universities were allowed to accept up to 2% of the entering freshman class and transfer students from applicants who would not ordinarily qualify for admission to the University system. Ordinarily only those students ranking in the top 12-1/2% of their high school graduating class were eligible for the University system. When universities throughout the country began to try to do something about the underrepresentation of minority group students, this figure was increased to

4% with at least 2% always reserved for EOP and for special education programs at the undergraduate level. This means that UCLA, with 13,500 undergraduates and 4,877 freshmen and transfer students, could accept up to 200 students who didn't meet the normal standards for admission. When UCLA began the EOP program, it found that there was a large number of capable minority group students who could be expected to do well at the University and were eligible for regular admission, but who did not perform well. Seldom did UCLA admit students who automatically fell in the 4% range for inadmissible students.

The EOP program at UCLA did an excellent job of recruiting new students. Of those enrolled in the fall of 1968, 31% were black, 25% had Spanish surnames, 18% were white, no ethnic information was available for 18%, and 1% were "other." A careful analysis of the qualifications of the EOP students showed, however, that while most were actually eligible for admission to UCLA, they probably wouldn't have gone. Why, then, hadn't they simply applied for UCLA in the regular fashion? The evaluators concluded that there were three reasons that new students had not previously applied to UCLA: finances, geography, and culture.

The EOP program sought to deal with each of these problems:

1. Geography. Most new students live in ghettos, some of which were quite a distance from the UCLA campus, and public transportation is notoriously bad in the Los Angeles area. To overcome this, the EOP program sent recruiters to predominantly minority group high schools whose students had never considered the possibility of UCLA. Funds were provided for EOP students to live on campus to overcome this geographic barrier. EOP students then became a favored minority on the UCLA campus, which is largely populated by students from the middle-class suburbs who commute by automobile, via the adjoining freeways.

2. Finances. EOP students were given whatever financial aid they needed to enroll at UCLA. State funds were combined with grants from the Rockfeller and Danforth Foundations. The largest source of funds was the three federal financial aid programs: Educational Opportunity Grants, National Defense Student Loans, and College Work-Study program jobs. Freshmen were advised to keep the loan and job portion of their financial aid package small until they had adjusted to college and were sure they were going to make it. For the academic year 1969-70, the student aid funds available to the 1500 EOP students at UCLA totaled approximately $1,900,000, or about $1300 per student. It was estimated that a student's total cost of attending college (and living on campus) was approximately $2,000. Each student's financial situation was assessed individually and no student was denied access to the program on financial grounds.

3. Culture. It was determined that one of the reasons that the new students hadn't been attending UCLA was that they had grown up and gone to high school in predominantly minority group settings. UCLA, as a predominantly white institution, represented a different way of life, and for many of these students, this would be a real culture shock. UCLA attempted to ameliorate this by counseling and tutoring. Each EOP student was assigned a "master tutor," usually a graduate student who served as a big brother and also helped to explain the functioning of the academic system. Each student was also counselled fairly extensively by the EOP staff, the majority of whom were minority group members. The counseling and tutoring was also expensive, with UCLA spending about $520,000 or $350 per student on this phase of the

program in the academic year 1969-70. (UCLA's proportion of the total University system-wide expenditure of nearly $8 million, was approximately one-third).

The principal complaint of those who evaluated the EOP, both at UCLA and system-wide, was that it was too exclusive. In effect, it was fine as far as it went, but it only admitted those who could have been coming anyway.

The EOP assembled new students in sufficient numbers so that they themselves were able to make the demands on the University that led to many of the subsequent moves made by the University. A large proportion of the students on the Chancellor's Taskforce were new students who had been admitted under EOP. It was only because of EOP that the black and Chicano students' organizations became important forces on campus.

## The High Potential Program (Hi-Pot)

The principal contribution of the Student Entry Committee of the Chancellor's Taskforce was the Hi-Pot program, which was conceived principally by new students in the Black Students Union (BSU) and the United Mexican-American Students (UMAS). The ideas were worked up by the students during the summer of 1968, and the program launched in the fall quarter of the academic year 1968-69. The aim of the students was to enroll minority group members who had the potential to absorb higher education, but were clearly inadmissable by present university standards. The recruiters for the program were black and Chicano students already enrolled at UCLA. They had come there primarily through the EOP program.

The recruiters were paid for a month and a half's work ending in September 1968. They were trained by Professor Thomas Robischon of the Graduate School of Education, who was a consultant to the program, and operated out of recruitment centers--one in South-Central Los Angeles for blacks and one in East Los Angeles for Chicanos. Approximately 400 students were interviewed, first in groups and then individually, and the student recruiters recommended 60 blacks and 60 Chicanos for admission to the University. The 120 students were then screened by a faculty committee that wound up recommending 50 blacks, 48 Chicanos, 1 Puerto Rican and 1 Costa Rican. The average age of the group was 21. The population was two-thirds male and one-third female. One-third of the blacks and 20% of the Chicanos had previously been enrolled in junior college.

The selection criteria were drawn up by the students themselves. The two prime requisites were that the students be black and Chicano and that they not be admissable by the University's usual standards. The original criteria as designed by the students on the Student Entry Committee were six:

1. Motivation.--Motivation to pursue education at the University; demonstrated and sustained motivation in pursuit of another objective.

2. Originality, creativity and inventiveness.--These could be demonstrated by an uncommon creativity in the arts or sciences; original inventions; demonstrated writing or speaking capacity; or courage and flair in social action.

3. Initiative and leadership.--These could be evidenced by spontaneous and self-directed efforts to bring the attention and respect of others. Such leadership might be demonstrated in controversial situations or reform movements.

4. Sophisticated humor.

5. Autonomy and self-directedness.

6. Uniqueness.

The students' position paper ended the discussion of these criteria for selection by noting:

> It is not expected that most applicants will demonstrate all of these characteristics to a prominant degree. But the presence of one or more in well developed form should be carefully considered as evidence of suitability for University admission.

When the program became operational, the stated criteria for recognizing high potential were the following three which bore close resemblance to the original six characteristics listed by the students: basic intelligence; self-assuredness; motivation and endurance.

The staff members of the Hi-Pot Program were selected on the basis of their empathy for the goals of the program. There were two administrators and eight instructors--four blacks and four Chicanos. Five of the eight instructors were graduate students at the University. The entire staff was interviewed and approved by members of UCLA's English and History Departments.

The Hi-Pot program was conceived as a five-year program, with the first year spent primarily in preparatory and remedial education, with students first being instructed entirely by the High Potential staff and gradually moving into the regular curriculum.

The budget for the first year of the program was approximately $225,000, with most of the money coming from student registration fees. Administratively, the program was joined with the Upward Bound Program that had already been in existence at UCLA, and the Educational Opportunities Program, to form the Department of Special Educational Programs under the direction of Mrs. Mary Jane Hewitt.

The curriculum of the HI-POT program was organized around two basic objectives:

1. To give the students the opportunity for a positive self-concept by providing the opportunities for exploration, analysis, and understanding of the Afro-American and Chicano experience in American society.

2. To develop the basic communication skills (oral and written) and reading skills (speed and comprehension) needed for success at the University.

The educational programs for the black and Chicano students were separate. In each case, the emphasis at first was on developing a positive self-concept, and only later on developing communication skills. In the first quarter, black students had four courses: The Negro Dialect, The Afro-American Oral Tradition, The Changing Status of the Black Man in White America, and The Afro-American Literary Experience. In the second quarter, the initiative changed to an emphasis on communication skills and the black students had one regular University course which was specially geared for them--Recurring Philosophical Themes in Black Literature. This course differed from the four that the black students had taken in the previous quarter because the relationship was formal and impersonal between the lecturer and the students, the class size was large, and the students were not formally required to attend class.

Chicano students followed the same pattern. In the first quarter their courses were entitled: Barrio English as It Relates to Standard English, Composition in The University Context, Chicano Intellectual Thought, and Mexican History As It Relates to the Southwest. Again in the second quarter, emphasis shifted to communication skills, particularly English. In the second quarter, 18 of the Chicano students took a regular University course entitled "Chicano Intellectual Thought."

By the third quarter of the year, 80 per cent of the students were enrolled in at least some standard University courses.

The Chicanos did slightly better than the blacks in terms of completing the first year. Twenty per cent dropped the program and did not return for the second year. Thirty per cent of the Chicanos were taking a full course load by the third quarter, while 30 per cent succeeded in one or two courses. Sixteen per cent did not succeed in any University course but did well enough in the High Potential program to be recommended for admission to the University. Thirty-four per cent of the blacks left the program throughout the year. Forty per cent succeeded in three courses during the spring quarter, 12 per cent succeeded in two courses and 24 per cent did not take any courses but did well enough in the High Potential program to be recommended to the University.

The overall statistical results of the first year's program were fairly encouraging considering the fact that the students were recruited late in the summer and would not have been considered eligible for admission to the University.

The High Potential program has had much more trouble and has been much more controversial than the Educational Opportunities program. In a dispute over the choice of director for the new Afro-American Studies Center, five High Potential students were involved in a killing in Campbell Hall on January 17, 1969. Two black High Potential students were shot to death and three were involved in the killing. The result of this incident was that nine black students left the High Potential program.

There were also serious problems with policy and with staff. During the second year of the program--1969-70--there were four ethnic components, not two. The first year essentially two separate programs were operating, but the second year there were four. There was high turnover among the instructional staff, in part because the first staff had been recruited at the last minute. There were complaints that the students were picked for political reasons--that is, their involvement in ethnic power movements--rather than for their potential as students in college. There were complaints from the Special Education Department that the High Potential staff did not coordinate sufficiently with other elements in the program. This led to turnover and dissatisfaction within the unit that was supposed to coordinate all special education programs. First, Mary Jane Hewitt left the University "in exasperation," then Joe Barry, who succeeded her after being one of the principal developers of the Hi-Pot program, left in the summer of 1970. The summer of 1970 the High Potential program was reorganized to deal with problems of admission and coordination with the other special education programs.

Other Special Education Programs

The Summer Work Opportunity Program.--This program gave Los Angeles high school students the opportunity to work on a variety of research projects at UCLA during the summer.

The College Commitment Program.--The College Commitment Program allowed UCLA undergraduates to work in high schools to help minority group students learn about and plan to attend college. The College Commitment Program also engaged in tutoring. One of the high points of the program was a career day held at a high school, where black people spoke to the students about their occupations and how to prepare for them. The program basically depended on student volunteer work and there have been problems in administration and with shortages of students to work in the program. The College Commitment Program was originally planned by students on the Chancellor's Taskforce and it came into being in the summer of 1969. It has been largely a black student operation working out of the Department of Special Education.

## Graduate Level Educational Opportunity Programs

There has been an extensive effort to increase the number of minority group students at the masters and doctoral level. The Law School sponsored a joint summer program with Loyola University to prepare minority group students for law school. The Graduate Schools of Education and Business have each offered a variety of scholarships to minority group students. All of these programs together helped to raise the minority group enrollment in graduate school at UCLA to 14% by the academic year 1969-70.

A special project designed by C. Z. Wilson is the Faculty Development Program. It was seen as a special way of providing minority group faculty members. The program has aimed to bring to the University 20 to 30 professionals a year on academic appointments in various fields and also to provide support so that they could obtain a Ph. D., while teaching only a limited course load. UCLA has also changed its policy against hiring its own graduates because it feels that the best way to increase minority group representation of the faculty is to train its own minority group faculty. From the start it was intended that the minority group faculty in the Faculty Development program would play a large role in the ethnic centers.

## The Upward Bound Program

UCLA has operated a fairly substantial Upward Bound program (an Office of Education College Preparatory program) under the direction of the Special Education Department. All of the special education programs and the ethnic centers are located in Campbell Hall. Upward Bound students are there also during their summers on campus. A problem at many colleges is that the Upward Bound programs have been too segregated from the rest of the college, the minority group students from Upward Bound program being there during the summer and the white students being there during the fall. Students in Upward Bound at UCLA have been much more a part of the University. Their presence in Campbell Hall helps to establish it as the center for ethnic minorities on campus. Special efforts have been made to assure that graduates of Upward Bound would be enrolled in UCLA as undergraduates.

## Programs Proposed But Not Yet Begun

The Chancellor's Taskforce proposed two additional programs which could help ethnic minorities and were fairly unusual and promising, but they haven't yet begun. The "Bombed-Out" program was conceived as a way to give a second chance to students who had flunked out of the University of California system. This is especially important because many special education programs appear to be a last opportunity for minority group students. Growing up in the educational system, they have come to expect failure, but failure in a special education program at a university often means losing the last chance of obtaining upward social mobility. The "Bombed-Out" program would have attempted to give them a second chance.

The Junior College Liaison Program would have seen the institutions in the University of California system working closely with the junior colleges in the area to make sure that a higher proportion of minority group students would transfer to the University system after completing their first two years at community colleges. At present, liaison is poor and community college students frequently have no idea what the university will require of them. This program was also an excellent idea, but hasn't yet gotten off the ground.

## The Veterans Special Education Program

The Extension Division of UCLA began a special program to educate minority group veterans and to prepare them to attend college. H. Carroll Parish, the Director of Financial Aid, was the originator of the idea and he worked to obtain special benefits for Vietnam veterans both at UCLA and throughout the University of California system. The program at UCLA has been under the direction of Edward (Chip) Anderson.

It has been a twelve week course charging a minimal sum of $100, and the veterans have been eligible to obtain GI benefits of $175 per month while enrolled. Because there is a lag between applying to the Veterans Administration and receiving funds, the program has made a $250 loan available to those who have needed it, and provided scholarships to those who couldn't afford the $100 fee. The program has been quite successful with approximately 80% of those completing it enrolling in college, many at UCLA.

The program has had the twin aims of offering counseling and information about college careers and imparting of special studies skills. The curriculum has included: Meaningful Mathematics, Principles of Oral Communication, Reading and Study Improvement, English Composition and The Psychology of Human Relations.

Apparently this program was the first extension program in the country planned especially for veterans of Vietnam whose prior socio-economic backgrounds had not prepared them for higher education, and whose lack of high school achievement made them inadmissible to college. The program was conducted in downtown Los Angeles, rather than at the more inaccessible UCLA campus.

## The Impact of the Special Education Programs

A large proportion of colleges and universities now offer special education programs for those students who hadn't normally been admissable. UCLA differs from the vast majority of colleges in the range of programs offered and in the total number of students enrolled. It is the large number of minority group students who have come in through these programs who have made the ethnic centers which will be the subject of the balance of this chapter a possibility. What has been especially impressive at UCLA is the large role the students played in planning the programs and the speed with which the University implemented large-scale programs. One of the reasons that the University was able to move so quickly on such a broad scale was that it had been involved in the Educational Opportunities Program since 1964, and had alrady obtained a solid background in the area.

The Planning of the Ethnic Centers.--The Ethnic Centers program which originally grew out of the Chancellor's Taskforce in the summer of 1968, was marked by controversy, ambiguity, conflict and discord from the beginning. All four centers--Afro-American, Chicano, American Indian, and Asian-American--were operational by the fall of 1970, but only the Afro-American and American Indian centers had full-time permanent directors by that time. All had immense problems in the first two years, which included turnover of administrative personnel, changes in goals and orientation, lack of cooperation and coordination with each other, and strife with the administration over function, funds, staffing, and space. However, despite all the problems, Chancellor Young and Vice-Chancellor Wilson were commited to the concept of the four ethnic centers and they are now emerging as viable entities directed by the individual ethnic groups themselves.

The idea for the ethnic centers came from the black students who were involved on the Chancellor's Taskforce in the summer of 1968. They originally prepared a document entitled "Social Relevancy and The University," which was an inventory of what was being done at the University in terms of community action, instruction, and research; proposed a broadening of courses; and suggested the creation of the Center for the Study of Afro-American History and Culture. Much of what was written about the Center by the black students was included in the final report of Subcommittee III of the Chancellor's Taskforce, entitled "Urban Research and Problem Solving." This document proposed the establishment of an Institute for the Study of American Cultures, a Bureau of Urban Affairs to be located within that center, a Journal of American Cultures, and a Center for the Study of Afro-American History and Culture. Most of the work of both the Institute and the Center would have been of a research nature.

During the academic year 1968-69, the Ethnic Centers program was under the administrative responsibility of Paul Proehl, the Vice-Chancellor for University Relations and Public Programs. He approved the concept but had a very specific idea about how the four ethnic centers would function in an Institute for American Cultures. His idea was based on his own experience as Director of UCLA's African Studies Center, which had been a high calibre academic research unit turning out quality scholarly materials on such subjects as The African Arts. Proehl's idea was that the Centers would be fairly traditional academic research units staffed by "fully qualified professionals." This was at almost total variance with what the students envisioned and what had come into existence by the fall of 1970.

Each of the four centers has evolved a special character. There is heavy student involvement in each and each seeks to aid the education at UCLA of that particular minority group. The thrust of both the Afro-American Center and the Chicano Cultural Center is to uplift the self-image of blacks and Chicanos. All four centers have been involved in service to their communities.

All four ethnic centers and all aspects of the special education programs (Educational Opportunities Program, High Potential Program, and Upward Bound) are located in Campbell Hall and that itself is a story. Originally Campbell Hall had been promised to the English and Slavic Languages Departments and money had been set aside to remodel it for their use. The Special Education Programs and Ethnic Centers were placed there only temporarily. With all of the travail that the Centers and the Special Education Programs went through, including the shooting of the black students, Campbell Hall took on a special significance. In the fall of 1969, Chancellor Young decided that the Ethnic Centers and the Special Education Programs could be permanently housed there.

Campbell Hall is truly the center for ethnics on campus but the nature and condition of the building itself in the summer of 1970 told a lot about the problems the programs had experienced. The building was crowded and bustling, with few white faces in evidence. The contrast between the attractive well-landscaped UCLA campus and the decrepit interior of Campbell Hall would be something of a shock to a first-time visitor. Because the Centers are still in transition and no overall plan for remodeling the building has been settled on, the interior is dirty and rundown, with the walls covered by graffiti. The individual offices are in far better shape than the public spaces but the furnishings are still far from permanent and there is a great deal of casualness and disorder. Interestingly enough, despite the fact that all ethnic units are in one building and each of the offices is busy, there is little interaction between Centers.

## The Afro-American Studies Center

In January 1969, Chancellor Young announced the four ethnic study centers would begin and that their heavy emphasis would be on research. As noted earlier, the Black Students Union had been responsible for the idea and since the beginning of the Ethnic Centers programs, the Afro-American Studies Center has been the most controversial of the centers.

The murder of two Black Panther High Potential students in Campbell Hall on January 19, was a shocking and tragic event that made national news. It was the outgrowth of a power struggle involving Los Angeles black leader (and former UCLA student) Ron Karenga, the leader of an organization entitled US, and the local Black Panther group. A number of black leaders in the Los Angeles area had banded together to make sure that blacks would have a say in programs affecting them and they had proposed that Charles Thomas, a psychologist and Education Director of the Watts Health Center, be named the Director of the Afro-American Studies Center. Originally, the black students in the BSU had felt that it was important to express solidarity and they had worked together with the black leaders in the Los Angeles community in urging the administration to appoint Thomas. The administration objected however, primarily on the grounds that the clinical psychologist was not entitled either to a

$23,000 salary or to tenure, and they offered him $16,000. Some black students began to have doubts about Thomas's commitment to their program and they wanted to withdraw their support. The Black Panthers took the side of the students who had doubts about Thomas and who resented his being pushed on them by outsiders.

A black student who had participated in plans for the Afro-American Studies Center from the beginning noted that in the weeks prior to the shooting a large number of black students had been carrying guns on campus and that there was a great deal of fear and tension. A meeting was called in Campbell Hall on January 19 to try and smooth over the disagreements over the appointment of a new director and to achieve solidarity within the Black Students Union. As John Jerome Huggins, 23, and Al Prentice (Bunchy) Carter, 26, local Black Panther leaders, left the meeting on the first floor of Campbell Hall, guns were drawn and they were each fatally shot. Law enforcement personnel descended on the scene and the assailants were located fairly quickly. Three High Potential students, who were apparently affiliated with US, George Steiner, 22, his brother Larry, 21, and Donald Hawkins, 20, were convicted of murder in September 1969, and sentenced to life imprisonment.

This shooting and the subsequent revolutionary tone of some of the black leaders caused many of the black students to drop their further participation in the program of the Center. The University supported a retreat for black students shortly after the shooting, where they got a chance to pull themselves together. Since the shooting, the problems of the Afro-American Studies Center have been of a more academic nature.

The problems of the Afro-American Studies Center since the spring of 1969 have centered around leadership, shortage of black faculty, and whether or not a separate Department of Black Studies should be inaugurated on the UCLA campus. Robert Singleton, a member of the Faculty of Business Administration and a doctoral candidate, was appointed interim director of the Center in April of 1969, and in the summer of 1970, Arthur Smith, a highly qualified professor of speech was appointed the Director. Leroy Higgenbottom, an older and extremely militant and outspoken black man, who had devised and taught an innovative program for urban internships at the School of Architecture, was appointed Assistant Director. Now that the Center has strong leadership which is well accepted by the academic community, it has an excellent chance of making rapid progress.

Among the accomplishments of the Afro-American Studies Center in its first year of operation (1969-70) were a Black History Week, the setting up of courses in black studies which lead to a major, the compiling of bibliographies and a library in the field of black studies, and a series of programs. The Black Students Union put out a newspaper, NOMMO, but it too has been plagued by controversy. In January of 1970, the editors, Edward Maddox and Paul Montgomery, resigned because they felt that their principal qualifications were those of objective news reporters rather than proponents of socialist revolution. An article in a February issue of the UCLA Daily Bruin on the Afro-American Studies Center contained a number of quotes from black faculty members who were extremely critical of the administration's relations with the Center. The article commented that black students insist that the University is only willing to help "in its own way:"

> "The University does not have a commitment to help minorities as a whole, according to one black student. 'The administration of all the Studies Centers is very racist and there has been a conscious effort to keep minorities apart,' the student said. "Because of internal control over financing and other things, it was impossible for the Centers to function.' He believes that the administration 'tried to make it look like the Centers were being run by minorities, which was not true."

With the appointment of Smith and Higgenbottom in the summer of 1970, the Afro-American Studies Center seems to have stabilized considerably. Smith had a clear picture of the goals of the Center which were: research, curriculum development, and cultural programs. One of the principle aims of the Center will be black development, or the training of black leadership and technical capacity. It is hoped that the Center will have a close relationship to the black community of Los Angeles and be able to be an agent on campus for helping to secure the goals of the black community.

One of the principle thrusts of the Afro-American Studies Center will be the Journal of Black Studies, with the first issue coming out in the fall of 1970. The Editor of the Journal is Arthur Smith, the Director of the Center, and on its editoral and advisory boards are a large number of the outstanding Black scholars in the nation.

## The Chicano Cultural Center

At the end of the summer of 1970, the Chicano Cultural Center was still without a full-time "academically qualified" director, but it had been headed for a year by an extremely capable administrator, Administrative Coordinator Gil Garcia. The three principle thrusts of the Center have been the putting-out of a Journal, the forging of ties with Chicano communities and the assisting of department in recruiting

Mexican-American faculty. A proposed Chicano studies program has been hampered by the fact that as of the academic year 1969-70, there were only two Chicano faculty members and they have been able to offer only two courses.

Gil Garcia was extremely critical of the University for not giving enough financial support to the Center and in being slow in refurbishing the headquarters of the Center. His principal complaint however was about the inherent conservatism and elitism of University faculty members:

> We are dealing with a group of people who represent the Establishment, and think they are morally, intellectually and racially superior to us. This dehumanizing process will eventually permeate all the members of this society in order for these elite, self-appointed, high priest, senile, assinine, ignoramus, chrome-plated garbage cans to rule and never be challenged.

Despite a certain degree of animosity toward the administration, Gil Garcia has been extremely proud of the solidarity of the Chicano students and feels that he, the faculty members and students can move the administration if they stick together and demand what is needed to make the Center function. One of the principal thrusts of the Chicano Cultural Center and one of the areas in which it has been most successful has been the raising of the image of Mexican-Americans. Gil Garcia and the Center have accomplished this in a number of ways. The Journal, AZTLAN (Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and The Arts), is a first rate publication (in English) with striking art work, challenging and scholarly articles, and a proud tone. Gil Garcia and the students have accomplished a great deal despite frustrations. The very appearance of the Center is first rate, with Mexican-American artifacts and art work. The Chicano Cultural Center presents a bright contrast to most of the rest of grimy Campbell Hall.

The Chicano Center has been deeply involved in the community. The Centro Universitario was established through the Extension Division and attempted to provide education for the Chicano community in the community. Chicano students were deeply involved. However, because of uncertainty about its success and general fund cutbacks throughout the University of California, the program has been curtailed. Mexican-American students worked with the Law School to secure the funding for La Casa Legal de Los Angeles (The Legal House of Los Angeles) to supply legal services to the Chicano community of Los Angeles. This program was funded for the academic year 1970-71. Chicano students have also been involved in tutoring in the Chicano community in the Teen Opportunities Program.

Perhaps the most significant thing about the Center is the fact that a prestigious and powerful institution such as UCLA has come out on the side of Chicano culture and self-pride.

## American Indian Cultural Program

In many ways, this is the slowest of the four centers to get off the ground. It did not get its first full-time director until Anthony Purley was appointed to the post in the summer of 1970. The Indian Center faced more difficult problems than the other three, because there was an almost complete lack of Indian faculty and students at UCLA and there was a shortage of potential faculty for recruitment.

Until the summer of 1970, the principal thrust of the Center was to recruit Indian students to the University.

Anthony Purley's background was in industry, where he worked on federal poverty programs involving Indians. He is plugged in to the new American Indian leadership which stresses self-determination and pride.

As of the summer of 1970, the goals of the Center were fairly indeterminate. There is a plan to tie the University to an Indian boarding school to show how it could be improved with proper management and resources. The principal function of the Indian Center up until now has been to serve as a resource for the Indian students on campus and as such it has been extremely important.

The Asian-American Studies Center

The Asian-American Studies Center has differed from the others in several respects. There are a great variety of ethnic components among the Asian-Americans including Americans of Japanese, Chinese and Filipino ancestry. Only the Filipinos could be considered substantially disadvantaged from an educational and economic point of view. Although the Asian-Americans are the largest minority group at UCLA, they are also the least organized and the most apathetic, in part due to the fact that most of them have been doing fairly well. The Center has suffered from not having a full-time director and from having a less focused program.

Nevertheless a small group of Asian-American students have been deeply involved in the Center and they have evolved a variety of community programs including a Free University in Chinatown, the teaching of English as a second language to new immigrants and tutoring programs. Some research is underway, but it is difficult to determine what shape this will take.

There is a feeling of dissatisfaction and lack of focus on the part of the students. An article in the Daily Bruin on the Center in February of 1970, was highly critical of the administration and noted that the Center had succeeded in buying off the militant Asian- Americans while the rest had remained apathetic.

Colin Watnaaba, an Asian student involved with the Center who was extremely critical of it, felt that the principal purpose of ethnic studies should be to revolutionize the educational system.

> You can't start new things while the University is still straight-jacketed in its orientation to turning out degrees. We started Ethnic Studies and it ended up just like a regular University course--that's why many people see it as a dead end thing. The goal is to change the institutions of the society and also the people of the society. When we talk about doing this in the University framework, it's too limited a framework.

Associate Director of the Center, Yuji Ichioka, felt that the Center has very little power as a result of administration checks that restrict the scope of its activities:

> In setting up these programs, the University hasn't changed structurally. We cannot hire faculty; we cannot teach courses ourselves; nor can we grant a degree.

Partially because the Asian-American students and the Asian-American communities have less needs, the Asian-American Studies Center has served less of a function and has evolved less clear cut goals. Despite the fact that there has been a general feeling of frustration, a large number of students have been involved and they have at least come to grips with the problem of trying to change the system of higher education.

There have been spin-offs from the Ethnic Centers themselves. One of the most interesting was the UCLA program of Ethnic Studies in Venice, carried on during the summer of 1969, involving both Mexican-American history and Afro-American history, taught by college students to high school students in Venice. Eight instructors taught twelve courses. The principal goal was not just to impart ethnic information, but also to build a sense of self-pride and interest of high school students in going to college. Not only did the high school students who took the classes benefit, but the undergraduate and graduate students who had to prepare and deliver the courses got a great deal out of it. As the Ethnic Centers grow and become stronger, a variety of such inter-Center community service projects should become possible.

## The Administration's Point of View on the Program

David Saxon, the Vice-Chancellor of the University, summed up his reaction to the early life of the Ethnic Centers by stating that they had done about as well as could have been expected but not as well as he would have liked. Certainly no one could have forseen the conflict and controversy that has marked each of the Centers and the programs in general. Although the administration is criticized by representatives of all four Centers, it has provided adequate space and substantial funding in the neighborhood of $1/2 million for the academic year 1970-71.

Vice-Chancellor Wilson has a clear picture that the Centers should develop as the ethnic minorities who will be served by them desire and not according to a blueprint emanating from the higher administration. He is pleased by the important role students have played in each of the Centers. He is hopeful that, now that the students have played the major role in getting the Centers going, the faculty will see their potential and will become deeply involved, as has already been the case in the Afro-American Studies Center.

Although the Centers have been plagued by problems and are at present far from perfect, they offer an excellent model for applying pressure to the university for change from within. If the administration had been less sure of itself and not had the substantial public funding which makes it a first-class institution, the program would probably have never been started in the first place and certainly wouldn't have been continued in the face of the difficulty and controversy encountered.

Selected References on UCLA

Kitano, H., and Miller, D., An Assessment of Educational Opportunity Programs in California Higher Education. Scientific Analysis Corp., San Francisco, 1970 (mimeographed report).

Weiler, D., and Rogers, M., The UCLA Educational Opportunities Program: 1964-1968. System Development Corp., Santa Monica, California, 1969 (A "Technical Memorandum" Report).

Rhodes, B., UCLA High Potential Program: 1968-1969, University of California, Los Angeles, 1970, (mimeographed report.)

# THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO AND
# THE WOODLAWN COMMUNITY

George Nash

The University of Chicago's sociologists have specialized in studying the city, yet somehow until recently its scholars had remained above the problems and were not involved in action programs. Faced with the disintegration of its immediate neighborhood--Hyde Park-Kenwood--the University instigated a massive urban renewal project which made the neighborhood a better place in which to live except for the poor blacks, most of whom were forced to move. However, many critics have complained that the rebuilding of Hyde Park-Kenwood took too little account of the wants and needs of community residents.

When the nearby black community of Woodlawn attempted to organize to improve itself, the University administration was hostile and uncooperative at first. Perhaps it was hard for University administrators to believe that a poor black community could do something for itself. Woodlawn is a somewhat poorer than average black community of high density. Its 60,000 residents, almost all of whom are black, live in a run-down neighborhood of about one square mile. Median family income was $4,400 in 1960.

On the basis of this past history, the present mutually beneficial relationship between the University of Chicago and The Woodlawn Organization (TWO) is surprising and unexpected. Yet the seeds of today's cooperative ventures were planted during the days of distrust. The present working relationship is based on three elements:

1. The emergence of a strong, popular, indigenous community organization--TWO--which has combined militancy with flexibility. It has grown on the basis of its success and its ability to work with the University of Chicago.

2. The strong but pragmatic administration of the University learned from its experiences in doing things the old and less satisfactory way.
3. A number of separate projects were begun by the University in the Woodlawn area and each has been modified under pressure from The Woodlawn Organization to better serve the needs of the community. The experiences of these four University ventures--a community mental health center, a child care center, a community school board, and a legal clinic--plus cooperative ventures in planning and housing have built a base upon which future, more comprehensive efforts will be able to draw.

The programs cited above were started independently by various elements of the University in the mid-1960s. What drew them together into a comprehensive program having wide applicability for other universities and other poor communities was the University's working with The Woodlawn Organization (at the latter's request) to prepare its Model Cities program in 1968.

The special features of the University of Chicago itself made it better able to respond to the urban problems of The Woodlawn Organization than many other institutions of higher education would have been. Chicago is a fairly small (8,000 students, one-third of whom are undergraduates), private, prestigious co-educational institution. Almost all of the students attend full-time and the majority of the undergraduates live in University dormitories. There are few commuters. Since the University was founded in 1890 with a large grant from John D. Rockefeller, its outstanding feature has been academic excellence. A statement by

President Edward H. Levi describes it as:

> An extraordinary community of extraordinary scholars. At the heart of the University is the faith of its founders in the power of the unfettered human mind. The hallmark of the University has always been its interdisciplinary nature and its faith in basic research. Faculty, students, alumni; all are the inheritors of a tradition for responsibility and the responsibility for tradition.

The University is a true community of scholars with most of the faculty living in the surrounding Hyde Park-Kenwood area and walking to work. Chicago differs from other universities in the attachment felt for it by faculty and staff and the air of intellectual excitement generated by faculty and students alike. Although there is still a crime problem in the Hyde Park-Kenwood area, and the University is forced to spend a great deal of money on its own police force, Hyde Park-Kenwood is an excellent urban place in which to live, with good housing at reasonable prices for professionals, a good deal of racial integration, and reasonable cultural amenities.

To understand the present cooperative relationship between the University of Chicago and The Woodlawn Organization, it is necessary to know something of the history of each.

The University of Chicago's long-standing academic interest in the city traces to the Chicago School of Literature and the sociological research fostered by Robert Park and Ernest Burgess. Chicago's research on the city, which traces to the early 20s and continues today, has been vast, including classics by Louis Wirth (The Ghetto), Nels Anderson (The Hobo), and Harvey Zorbaugh (The Gold Coast and the Slum). The early focus was on the social problems of cities.

The University's setting is on the South Side of Chicago, which has become increasingly non-white in racial composition since the 1930s.

Faculty members who were resident in Hyde Park-Kenwood organized the first attempt at community renewal in 1949. When their efforts faltered, the University took the lead in forming the Southeast Chicago Corporation (SECC) in 1952. It has been headed from the start by Julian Levi, a lawyer, a full professor at the University, and the brother of the Chancellor.

The Southeast Chicago Corporation used aggressive tactics to prevent further deterioration of the Hyde Park-Kenwood area and was the sparkplug behind the urban renewal program which will eventually cost $300 million. Jack Meltzer, the original planner for the Southeast Chicago Corporation, is now the head of the Center for Urban Studies of the University of Chicago. At the same time that it was seeking to renew its front lawn (the Hyde Park-Kenwood area) the University had decided to expand across the Midway, traditionally the southern boundary of its campus, into the Woodlawn area. This expansion was not welcomed by the black, Woodlawn community.

The Woodlawn Organization traces its origins to 1959 when clergymen of different faiths became convinced that a powerful community organization effort was needed. Under the urging of clergymen of all faiths, and with financial support from the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, a coalition of community groups was formed and community organization was begun under the guidance of Saul Alinsky. Alinsky's Industrial Areas Foundation had successfully organized the predominantly white Back of the Yards area of Chicago. Alinsky did not plan or direct things; instead he made it possible for the people and leaders of Woodlawn to organize and direct themselves.

The Reverend Arthur Brazier, the black president of The Woodlawn Organization during the first ten years, was an equal match for the University's Julian Levi in aggressiveness, ability and pragmatism. He is also a dynamic, but diplomatic,leader. The Woodlawn Organization is a non-profit, tax exempt, community organization composed of more than 100 community groups--block clubs, civic groups, church groups, welfare unions, and two businessmen's associations. The basic goal of The Woodlawn Organization is the general one of improving the community. In Arthur Brazier's terms, The Woodlawn Organization has been organized around a variety of issues, and all of these have related to the general goal of "providing and preserving a suitable community environment for the residents of Woodlawn. We want a place that will be good for the poor, but we don't want it to be all poor. The University would probably like Woodlawn to be similar to Hyde Park Kenwood, but we will oppose this."

At the beginning, The Woodlawn Organization faced apathy on the part of the black residents of Woodlawn, seemingly overwhelming problems relating to housing, health, education, employment, and crime, and hostility from the University of Chicago.

The success of The Woodlawn Organization can largely be attributed to the capability of the indigenous black staff under the strategy that it developed in conjunction with Alinsky's people who pulled out as soon as the organization became viable. In operating in the community and relating to the University of Chicago, TWO developed three basic principles:

1. Broad citizen participation. 2,000 persons, mostly black residents

of Woodlawn, attended the Ninth Annual Convention of The Woodlawn Organization in April 1970. Hundreds of members of the community, men and women, old and young, serve on scores of boards and committees, or otherwise are directly involved in the planning and implementation of The Woodlawn Organization's programs.

2. Issues were chosen for which there would be across-the-board support in the community and on which clear, measurable, reasonably speedy victory was possible. For example, one of the first drives of The Woodlawn Organization was against unscrupulous businessmen in the Woodlawn area. An early survey by TWO determined that residents were being overcharged, short-weighed, and being delivered shoddy merchandise on poor credit terms. Hundreds of area residents marched to display their displeasure and a center was set up where people could report specific complaints, which were then directed to the offending merchants. The effect was a clearcut victory. Dishonest business practices sharply declined. The residents saw that People Power could achieve measurable victories. When The Woodlawn Organization went to court over rent strikes, hundreds of black neighborhood residents paid orderly visits to the courtroom.
3. The Woodlawn Organization developed a differentiated attitude in dealing with the University of Chicago. Because it was dealing with many units of the University on a variety of different problems and projects, it was inevitable that it would meet with varying degrees of success. The Woodlawn Organization learned that it could apply pressure and express dissatisfaction with one division of the University while working smoothly with another.

The Woodlawn Organization's conflict with the University traces to 1960 when the University announced plans to redevelop part of Woodlawn in much the same fashion that had been used in the Hyde Park-Kenwood area. There was a great deal of conflict, but eventually the University was required to take the desires of the Woodlawn community into account. Eventually, the University established a number of outposts in the Woodlawn area. Each of these was eventually planned in conjunction with The Woodlawn Organization and operated primarily for the benefit of the members of the community. A history of working together on specific projects led to the drawing up of an alternate Model Cities plan for Woodlawn in 1968.

The University's justification for providing services in the Woodlawn Community has been that it is learning new methods for developing services in urban areas. Once these new techniques are developed, they can be applied by service organizations in other parts of the country. The University's prime functions are as educator and developer of knowledge, rather than as a provider of services. The Model Cities plan provided the University with the opportunity to draw up a comprehensive, reproducible program based on its first-hand experiences in the Woodlawn area.

The principal dissatisfactions of The Woodlawn Organization with the original Model Cities plan prepared by Mayor Daley's administration were:

1. There wasn't enough citizen participation, either in its drawing up or implementation,
2. It simply perpetuated the status quo.

A central feature of all of the University's services provided to Woodlawn has been citizen participation. Participation has meant that the citizens of the area:

1. Help to determine what is needed,
2. Have a say in how the services are provided,
3. Are employed as fully as possible in the delivery of services,
4. Help to evaluate the success or failure of the program by serving on an advisory board.

As Arthur Brazier sees it, The Woodlawn Organization succeeded "Because people in Woodlawn developed a near obsession for self-determination."

In April 1968, The Woodlawn Organization asked the University's Faculty-Woodlawn Committee to assist its own Model Cities effort. Supported by foundation money, a student team at the Center for Urban Studies began accumulating data on the Woodlawn community that would be useful in the planning process. Task forces of faculty and graduate students, many of them already involved in a colloqium and summer study project (funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development) on the University's several demonstration programs in Woodlawn, were organized by the Center to lend expert advice on the problem areas selected by The Woodlawn Organization. The Woodlawn Organization organized its own corresponding standing committees of neighborhood residents which met together with the corresponding University student-faculty committees on a weekly basis. The tone of the cooperation effort was set in mid-June at a meeting in a Woodlawn church at which Julian Levi told an assembly of neighborhood residents, "You're going to decide, not the City and not the University, what kinds of solutions to Woodlawn's problems you're going to propose."

The Woodlawn Organization organized citizen participation and the University supplied the technical assistance. The University was working for the community in much the same manner that a lawyer represents a client. The community chose the University to work for it, helped determine the ground rules of the relationship, and had the right to accept or reject the University's suggestions. However, since there was a regular contact and feedback during the entire planning process, reciprocal education and accommodation went on continually. This meant that the final plan was much more likely to meet the real needs of the area's residents.

The final plan that was approved by The Woodlawn Organization in November of 1968 contained six areas:

1. Health.
2. Social service.
3. Law.
4. Environmental planning and housing.
5. Education.
6. Economic development.

Recommendations in all but the last were built around the actual experiences of programs operated in the Woodlawn area in conjunction with or with the assistance of the University of Chicago. We will now describe the development of the University's programs in Woodlawn and show how they fit into the final comprehensive Model Cities plan.

## 1. Health

The University of Chicago has had at least three major urban innovative involvements in the field of health: child care, community mental health, and drug addiction. We will focus on the University of Chicago's Woodlawn Child Health Center because it has encountered many of the problems that any such community-based facility will have to deal with and because it has emerged as a clear-cut success. Less has been written about it than about the Community Mental Health Center and the Experimental Schools Project, but the future of each of the latter is more uncertain. Perhaps the Child Care Center has had an easier time because it has not had to do battle with large established institutions such as the public school system.

Poor urban communities tend to have serious health problems which are partially the result of the inherent problems of the people themselves and secondarily a result of the inaccessibility or unavailability of health services. Woodlawn's health problems are extremely serious. The infant mortality rate, that critical index of how medically disadvantaged an area is, is 54 per 1,000.

Planning started in 1965 and in 1967 the University opened the Woodlawn Child Health Center financed by the United States Children's Bureau. The Center is part of a city-wide collaborative effort by the State of Illinois and the City of Chicago Board of Health with teaching centers to improve the availability of child health care.

The center is a bright, attractive facility which aims to provide high quality care with an attitude of respect for the patient. The furnishings are modern and attractive. Children in the waiting room can keep busy writing on blackboards or watching a large tank of tropical fish. Parents and children in the waiting room sit in comfortable chairs and generally seem cheerful. Relations between staff and patients and among the staff members themselves are warm and friendly. The Center is housed in a one-story brick building on a main shopping street in the heart of Woodlawn. The inside walls are decorated with colorful posters and with pictures of the Kennedys and Martin Luther King, Jr. The principal problem at the Center is now overcrowding. It sees 1,200 children per month and has files on about ten thousand different children whom it has seen in the first three years of its existence.

The staff of 32 is three-quarters black. One-third of the staff members actually live in the community. The director, John Madden, is a white pediatrician who has headed the Center since it was started. The staff appears highly motivated, pleased with their work and extremely competent. There has been low turnover among the staff. There has been extremely little controversy or conflict at the Center, despite the innovative nature of its mission and method of operation.

The Woodlawn Child Health Center has a number of features which allow it to deliver comprehensive services to the children of Woodlawn:

1. A community advisory board.
2. Location on a main street in the community which affords easy access.
3. Para-professionals who are primarily black residents of the local community.
4. A team approach where professionals and para-professionals work together on all of the problems of the child.

5. A bus which is used to bring handicapped or very ill children to the Center and those in need of more extensive care to the hospital.
6. Prevention in addition to treatment. Originally prevention was to be a major goal of the center, but it is estimated that prevention amounts to only about 20 per cent of the service provided.
7. A university affiliation. Albert Dorffman of the University of Chicago's Medical School's Department of Pediatrics originally conceived the idea. The Medical School also provides help in staffing by way of specialists, medical students and interns. The university setting also provided legitimation for the experimentation that has occurred and an opportunity to exchange ideas with the other University-related programs that are operating in Woodlawn.

## The Director

Some people who have led innovative, potentially controversial projects have been flamboyant, egotistical and abrasive. John Madden is none of these. He is mild-mannered, easy-going, informal and open, but at the same time he is competent and determined. The door to his office is open and staff members don't even knock before entering. Madden spends about half his time taking care of patients. His interest is operating the Center and he has not devoted much effort to disseminating the results of its experience. To date there has been no comprehensive description of its activity.

The community board plays a central role in planning and reviewing operations and is seen as the major way of assuring that the Child

Health Center meets the real needs of the children of Woodlawn. Originally it was thought that the board would be composed partly of people from the community and partly of people from the University. The Woodlawn Organization insisted that six of the eleven board members be from the community. In practice all of the board members have been community people and there are no professionals on the board. The board helps to determine policy, passes on personnel, and reviews operations.

The board and the director have a good working relationship but there have been difficulties. A major problem occurred in the spring of 1970 over the dismissal of a technician that the director viewed as disruptive. The dismissed technician told the board that he had been unfairly fired and requested that his case be reconsidered. The board decided that the dismissal should be stayed for a month while the matter was investigated. Madden told the board that if the technician were kept on he would resign as director. The board reconsidered and Madden stayed.

John Madden likes his work and feels that he has accomplished something and wants to stay. He's extremely popular with his staff. Relations between blacks and whites at the center are excellent and there has been no talk of replacing Madden because he is white.

The Community Advisory Board meets monthly and was especially important in establishing the original mission of the Center. The Center was originally conceived of as a referral center for public school teachers, nurses, board of health stations and other agencies. The staff and board quickly realized that this buffered them from the community, was cumbersome, and further served to fragment care. It changed in the first month to accept patients directly.

The board has provided valuable advice at all stages of the Center's history. For example, acting on the counsel of the board, advance publicity was held to a minimum in order to: (1) not make any promises that would subsequently be broken, and (2) not create a demand for services early in its operation that would overwhelm the facility.

## The Team Approach

Each patient is seen by an entire team consisting of a doctor, a nurse, a social worker, and a community worker. This means that when a person returns, he is known to at least several members of the team in the event there is rotation of staff. The social worker does a write-up of the entire range of problems of the child. If the family needs help with another agency, such as the Department of Welfare or the school system, the social worker contacts the agency. The community worker visits the home of the child to see how conditions there give rise to health problems. If necessary, she takes the Center's nutritionist along to make recommendations on diet problems.

The team approach allows professionals and non-professionals to work together with the non-professional being utilized to the fullest since his work is always subject to some review. Non-professional community workers appear satisfied with their role at the Child Health Center. This is due in large measure to the fact that they have expertise to contribute on the basis of their first-hand knowledge of the family's living conditions. Also, the nurses at the Woodlawn Child Health Center are allowed to make many decisions and play a large role in treatment because they work as part of a team.

## Comprehensive Care

One of the things the Center tries to avoid is forcing patients to go a long distance for treatment. Specialists come several times a week and the parents are now quite good about keeping appointments with them. The Center also has its own X-ray and laboratory facilities, although some of the samples drawn have to be sent elsewhere for testing. Only 1 per cent of those seen at the Center are sent to hospitals consequently.

## Prevention and Outreach

The community workers and the social workers have attacked a number of basic problems which give rise to poor health. They have worked to expand the free lunch program and to get food stamps. They have organized discussion groups for young mothers that center on such topics as shopping and housekeeping in addition to child health. A major effort of the Center has been to eliminate lead poisoning through increased enforcement and publicity directed at the problem. This has led the Center into conflict with the official city agency charged with dealing with lead poisoning which has attempted to convey the impression that the matter is "under control."

## The Relationship of the Child Care Center to Health Services in the Model Cities Plan

The central feature of the delivery of all services to Woodlawn, according to the Model Cities plan drawn up by The Woodlawn Organization and the University of Chicago, is a series of "pads," small centers located in storefronts and basements, each serving a two- or three-block area. The pads will have four functions:

1. Stimulating community organization,
2. Providing easy access to facilities, services, and institutions,
3. Giving early diagnosis of all sorts of problems,
4. Doing prevention and early treatment work.

Nurses will be available at the pads and ambulance service will be on call there. The pads will be open 24 hours a day. The community outreach workers would be located in the pads.

There would also be a single health center which would be modelled loosely after the Woodlawn Child Health Center. The Model Cities plan also calls for a new method of financing health care on the basis of compulsory health insurance program with the rates based upon family income.

The fit between the Model Cities plan and the Woodlawn Child Health Center model is not perfect. For example, the team would be broken up if the community worker is located in the pad rather than the health center. However, the experience of the Child Health Center has been of major importance in pioneering new methods which were drawn upon in the Model Cities plan.

## The Woodlawn Mental Health Center

Development of the Chicago Board of Health-Woodlawn Mental Health Center began when two psychiatrists, Sheppard Kellam and Sheldon Schiff, decided to attempt to study and systematically deal with the mental health problems of the total community. "We wanted to," as Dr. Schiff put it, "develop programs with the community which would prevent the wounds rather than to try to patch up these troubles later when they became more serious."

The Woodlawn Mental Health Center was the first of the outposts in Woodlawn operated by the University of Chicago. The need for an advisory panel was demonstrated when the co-directors got into a dispute with The Woodlawn Organization by wanting to rent space from a white absentee landlord rather than a black businessman in the community. In response to this early crisis, a watchdog committee was appointed by The Woodlawn Organization which later evolved into the advisory board of approximately 20 community residents that meets monthly.

Among the early involvements of the advisory board were decisions about the name of the organization and the type of furnishings that would be installed. The advisory board wanted to make sure that the name reflected the involvement of the community and not the City of Chicago. It wanted the furnishings to be durable and of high quality to indicate the Center's commitment to remain in the community.

More important, however, were the roles that The Woodlawn Organization and the advisory board played in the very mission of the Woodlawn Mental Health Center itself. Professionals in the area suggested that the Center concentrate on the severely disturbed. Members of the community, however, were more concerned with making Woodlawn a better place to live. They stressed prevention. The community people felt that the Mental Health Center should concentrate on children and their education, especially in the early years.

The Woodlawn Mental Health Center decided to work with children, their parents, and the schools to make early educational experiences more positive. The Center found out that seven out of every ten children in Woodlawn are, according to their teachers, failing to adapt to the learning situation as early as first report card time in first grade. If nothing is done about it, these children continue to fail in school. As in most poor black communities, there are major problems with the school system. Half of the children of Woodlawn drop out of the educational system before finishing high school.

The Mental Health Center has concentrated on increasing parents' involvement with the schools. Seventy per cent of the children in the schools involved have had at least one parental visit to the schools each year, and in 50 per cent of the cases there have been two or more visits. Teachers and principals have learned to relate to parents and to community people. Among the specific projects that the Center and the parents have collaborated on is the picking of history texts that show black people in a more realistic light.

Key elements of the program are the community representatives, one of whom is assigned to every two schools. The psychiatrists themselves do not work in the schools.

Although the Woodlawn Mental Health Center has achieved wide recognition and a good deal of favorable publicity, it has been extremely controversial within Woodlawn. Opponents have charged that the program attempts to force the children to accommodate to a corrupt school system rather than trying to change it. Sheldon Schiff, one of the co-directors of the Center, has been accused of being a racist and forced to resign.

Why has the Mental Health Center run into trouble? Does this demonstrate that white psychiatrists may be all right to start programs in black communities, but that they should then turn control over to blacks? John Madden, the director of the Child Care Center, disagrees.

"I've had no problem because of being white. Partially this is because the program has been effective and it's also due to the fact that the black residents of Woodlawn know how hard it might be to find a good black pediatrician to replace me."

In large measure, Sheldon Schiff's problems were due to the forcefulness of his personality and his method of doing things. He did not form a close working relationship either with the Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project or the Woodlawn Child Care Center. The director of the Experimental Schools Program actively opposed Schiff's leadership and was instrumental in having the Mental Health Center's program dropped by the Wadsworth School in the Experimental Schools Program. The Mental Health Center made extensive use of videotape and attitude surveys even though it upset a minority of community residents involved with the program. The two directors, Schiff and Kellam, did not get along with each other. In part, Schiff's brightness and perserverance, which were very helpful in setting up the program, did him in. He had a tendency to lecture rather than listen and this may have intimidated poor black people who felt intellectually inferior to any psychiatrist in the first place. Secondly, he projected a stance of antagonistic skepticism which may have been very effective in therapy, but which upset the community residents who had only a brief opportunity to interact with him.

Will the Woodlawn Mental Health Center endure? At this point the answer is uncertain. Both the University and The Woodlawn Organization are committed to the principle. University administrators feel that it has evolved a new form of community psychiatry. TWO staff feel that it is performing an important function. Arthur Brazier, the former president of TWO, reports that The Woodlawn Organization staff have confidence in Kellam, but that they didn't feel that they could work with Schiff. "They felt that he's too intransigent," he reported.

Since the Mental Health Center has confined its efforts to the schools, it might be argued that these functions should be taken over by the school system, especially since there is now an experimental school project. There is still a problem meeting the mental health needs of the population of Woodlawn that the Woodlawn Mental Health Center has never attempted to meet. The Woodlawn Child Care Center reports that lack of adequate mental health facilities is one of the area's most pressing problems.

### 2. Social Service

The University and the community are now working to implement some elements of the Model Cities plan. The University has not been especially innovative in the area of social services (or welfare), but a new building that the University was readying to coordinate the old type of services will be the base for an exciting new program financed by the State of Illinois.

The Model Cities Plan drawn up by the University of Chicago and The Woodlawn Organization had three features: (1) the separation of financial assistance from services with eligibility for financial assistance being determined easily by clear-cut criteria; (2) the provision for a minimum family income--$4,100 for a family of four compared to the current $2,500; (3) the availability of services to everyone regardless of whether or not they receive financial assistance.

When the City turned down The Woodlawn Organization and the University of Chicago's Model Cities plan, the situation looked bleak inasmuch as none of the proposed ideas were otherwise being contemplated in Woodlawn. The fact that a plan had been drawn up, however, allowed the State to select the Woodlawn program as one of three demonstration projects funded by the state legislature at the rate of $3.3 million per year with the aim of experimenting to find ways to improve the welfare system.

The state will administer the welfare or social services program in the Woodlawn area under the direction of a black man--Clinton McKay--who helped to develop new social service procedures in Pennsylvania. The approximately $1 million of State money will not be used for financial assistance or the provision of standard services, but rather will be for innovative programs such as the hiring of people from the community to work with employers to develop new jobs for Woodlawn residents. Less important than the money that the State will be providing will be an entirely new concept of the delivery of services which is in close agreement with the goals and procedures outlined in the Model Cities plan. Unfortunately, the $4,100 minimum family income for a family of four will not be part of the program.

Key elements of the new Woodlawn social service program will be the separation of the determination of eligibility from the rendering of assistance. Different offices will handle the two functions. Once it is determined that a person is eligible for either financial assistance or services, every attempt will be made to get people what they are entitled to on a purely objective basis. Speed and objectivity will be keynotes of the program.

One way to describe the new program is through some of the new terms:

1. People getting services will be consumers rather than clients;
2. A person who is getting something will get a requisition from a warehouse of services rather than assistance from an agency.

Among the first priorities are an early childhood development center and a day care center. A large proportion of the people employed in the delivery of services will be Woodlawn residents themselves.

A key link in the whole program is the modern new building built by the School of Social Service Administration of the University with the majority of funds being supplied by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. When this facility was being planned in 1966, it was envisioned as a one-stop social service center where representatives of all the various agencies dealing with Woodlawn people would be located. The attempt was to coordinate existing programs rather than render a new type of service. High on the priority list at the new center were the training of graduates of the school of Social Service Administration and research and evaluation. It is likely that neither will be a priority in the new program. University administrators had to give up the control of a facility that they had planned and raised the funds for. The State will have a community advisory board as did the School of Social Service Administration when it was planning the facility.

### 3. Law

For several years the University of Chicago Law School has operated the Edwin F. Mandel Clinic in conjunction with the Legal Aid Bureau. Active in the Clinic have been 50 students from the Law School, faculty members of the Law School, and a panel of 25 consulting attorneys who are active in the economic development and test case components of the Clinic's practice. Approximately 100 people visit the Clinic each week with legal problems in the areas of housing, consumer credit, domestic matters, welfare and juvenile and criminal law. Although many of the clients require only advice or minimal representation (a letter or a telephone call), approximately 25 per cent of the cases involve extensive representation and perhaps litigation. The Law School and the Clinic have attempted to engage in preventive law and community legal education through a series of articles in The Woodlawn Organization newspaper, The Observer, and by conducting forums such as ones on tenents' rights and the rights of citizens on the street.

Those who drew up the Model Cities legal program realized that the Mandel Legal Clinic suffered from a number of deficiencies in attempting to satisfy the legal needs of the community. First, because the Clinic was not community operated, many residents regard it with suspicion. Secondly, many Woodlawn residents consult an attorney only after the legal problem has reached the acute stage.

The Model Cities plan restricted the Mandel Clinic to trial and test cases which would seek to clarify and expand the rights of Woodlawn residents and to train community lay advocates to be para-professionals in the legal field. The plan also called for the provision of a number of new legal services such as the formation of a neighborhood law firm, a dispute service, and a youth advisory section to handle juvenile legal problems.

## 4. Environmental Planning and Housing

As far as The Woodlawn Organization is concerned, the major problem in Woodlawn is sub-standard housing. The Woodlawn Organization long ago went on record as saying that it wanted new housing to provide an economic mix allowing middle income people to move into the neighborhood. New housing was to escape the institutional stigma that characterizes much of the high-rise public housing that has been built in Chicago. The University of Chicago and The Woodlawn Organization have collaborated on several housing ventures.

It was the University's plan to build its new South Campus in Woodlawn with the aid of Urban Renewal which first brought the University and The Woodlawn Organization into conflict. Under a complex federal urban renewal formula the University of Chicago had accumulated credits which the City of Chicago could use in lieu of a cash contribution required from it for urban renewal proposed in the Woodlawn area. However, the University wanted assurance that it would be given the chance to buy some of the proposed urban renewal land for expansion of its South Campus. The Woodlawn Organization refused to go along with the plan until it was assured that something beneficial would come to the black Woodlawn community.

A deadlock ensued with a good deal of bitterness on both sides which was broken personally by Mayor Daley in 1963. The major points of the agreement were that:

1. A citizens' committee would be appointed by the Mayor to deal with urban renewal in Woodlawn and The Woodlawn Organization would have a majority of the members;

2. An area of deteriorated commercial structures would be cleared for low-rise, low-cost (but not public) housing;
3. No buildings on the projected South Campus would be demolished until construction of this housing was actually under way.

Woodlawn Gardens, a 26-building, 500-apartment complex, is now nearly completed on a 9-acre stretch of land. Rents range from $99 a month for an efficiency to $160 for a three-bedroom duplex. Preference is given to those who have previously been displaced by urban renewal. A portion of the apartments are being subsidized by the rent supplement plan. Although the apartments are all occupied and there is a long waiting list, relatively few very poor people have been able to move in. This is 221(d)III housing built with federal financing, but The Woodlawn Organization still needed help to plan and oversee construction of the buildings. The Kate Maremont Foundation provided the seed money for the program which will be returned by the federal government once the housing is completed.

The University of Chicago had originally planned to use part of its urban renewal land in the Woodlawn area for the construction of a veterans' hospital which it hoped would be a major employer of Woodlawn residents. The site for the hospital was shifted and the University has now leased the land to The Woodlawn Organization for housing. The University of Chicago is making temporary loans to The Woodlawn Organization not to exceed $500,000 to be used to secure architectural, legal and other necessary services which are prerequisites for full federal financing of this housing program. The University is also working with The Woodlawn Organization to help it secure financing for additional housing.

Another area in which the University has become involved is that of relocation of people who will be forced to move as a result of the new South Campus buildings. The number of families who need help beyond that normally provided is small, but unless special provisions had been made, they would have suffered serious problems.

The University made available $15,000 that was needed to meet the needs of people with three specific types of problems.

1. Some people had once lived in public housing and had moved out owing balances. They wanted to get back in but couldn't unless they cleared the balance.
2. There were people who wanted to buy houses and didn't have all the down payment.
3. Some people had once lived on the site and had moved off. Their moving expenses had been paid at that point. They now wanted to move back into the new housing, and there was no way of financing the second move.

The Model Cities plan for improving the environment and for housing called for a comprehensive plan aimed at improving the whole community and serving the needs of the people. The Model Cities plan recognizes that the improvement of housing and environment alone are not sufficient for community renewal. As Jack Meltzer, the Director of the Center for Urban Studies of the University of Chicago, states it:

> Experience has shown that when great resources are devoted to improving the physical environment in general and housing in particular, the community is more likely to be harmed than helped. When housing improvement is a precipitating event in community development, the high cost of clearing and acquiring land and of constructing new buildings leaves nothing over for the most important areas of jobs, schools, health, economic development, and so on.

Further, residents are usually not capable of properly keeping up the buildings, and they soon deteriorate; often rents for improved apartments are so high the original residents cannot afford them and actually end up moving into worse housing than they had at first; and small, informal groups of neighbors whose members were able to help each other are usually destroyed in the mechanics of relocation, and the impersonal design of new housing often impedes reformation of similar associations.

If, however, housing improvement is seen as a culmination of social, economic and cultural developments rather than as a cause of them, then it can be a significant result and measure of community improvement. Housing and environment must be considered in the context of a network of primary, social and economic improvements that should be going on in the community.

For any community to deal positively with the social and economic effects of land relocation and widespread physical changes it must be equipped with a strong sense of community, imaginative planning, effective agencies, and large resources. Only then will physical planning and change contribute to desired social and economic goals, although preparation for physical improvements should start simultaneously with other action. The physical structures of a community will be the embodiment of social and economic activities which are going on in the community, but to concentrate attention on the physical things is to treat symptoms and not causes.

## 5. Education

At present the Woodlawn Experimental School District operates ten schools (seven primary, two junior high, and one senior high school) as experimental schools with supplementary funding from Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Keys to the program are The Woodlawn Community Board, which is composed of 21 members (seven each appointed by The Woodlawn Organization, the University of Chicago, and the Chicago Public School System), and the director of the program, Barbara Sizemore, a black sociologist trained at the Graduate School of Education of the University of Chicago. Although the program is still in its early stages and has been controversial, the community board is functioning well, the University of Chicago and the public school system are committed to the idea, and major changes have been made in the schools which have already resulted in some measurable improvement.

As was the case with many other involvements of the University of Chicago in the Woodlawn area, this project started with a completely different purpose. In Summer 1965 a University-wide Committee on Urban Education began preparing plans to submit a proposal for an urban education laboratory. The proposal submitted in October 1965 was turned down because the Office of Education did not feel that there was enough community involvement. The Woodlawn Organization then brought strong pressure to bear to become a part of the project.

The mere working out of the ground rules prior to the submission of a second proposal was complicated, and finally it was agreed that anyone of the three parties represented on the proposed community school board could have a veto.

The Woodlawn Organization and the University of Chicago were both pleased with the proposal that was submitted in September 1966. There was shock when late in November the Office of Education decided not to fund the proposal. The University and The Woodlawn Organization jointly sought to have the decision reconsidered and made forceful representations to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (John Gardner) and the Commissioner of Education (Harold Howe). In January, 1967 the Office of Education reversed itself and awarded the funds.

Little remained of the University of Chicago's original unilateral idea for a research and development center in urban education. The Woodlawn Organization wanted basic changes made in the educational system and was not interested in "superficial or compensatory educational programs."

The original director of the program was a white professor at the University of Chicago's Graduate School of Education--Willard J. Congreve. Although his staff was all black, he eventually resigned voluntarily because he thought it was more appropriate that the program have black leadership. All three parties to the community school board concurred in the appointment of Barbara Sizemore. She is very forceful and capable and has gotten into major controversy with Sheldon Schiff of the Woodlawn Mental Health Center. She does not suffer from the failing of many educators who refused to acknowledge the existence of problems.

Among the early projects of the Woodlawn Experimental School Program have been the changing of teachers and the dealing with gangs. Most of the teachers that the board wanted to leave have gone voluntarily and there has been little confrontation with the teachers' union. There has been a strong effort to recruit outstanding teachers from outside of the
A major effort has been devoted to the elimination of warfare between the gangs because of the extent to which they intimidate students attempting to get to school.

In addition to improvements in the school, The Woodlawn Experimental School Project has been instrumental in starting a community education center which operates at one of the schools, offering a wide range of programs including recreation and computer courses.

In addition to the University of Chicago having been instrumental in securing the original funding, it serves an important role in legitimating the project. Furthermore, its involvement in Woodlawn has been a part of the whole new urban emphasis at the Graduate School of Education. Fringe benefits to the Woodlawn Experimental School Program have been other urban projects that the University's Graduate School of Education has been involved in, including the Master of Arts in Teaching program sponsored by The Ford Foundation where students are trained in a team and then go to work at a specific school, and the Triple T (The Training of Trainers of Teachers) of the Office of Education. Each of these programs has served as inputs of manpower into the Woodlawn schools.

The experience of the Woodlawn Experimental Schools Program has enabled Willard Congreve to distinguish five separate functions in which the community and the educators interact differently. They are summarized in the following chart:

| The Function | Who Should Be Accountable | Who Should Do It |
|---|---|---|
| Goal Setting | Client | Client with help from Educator $CL_{ed}$ |
| Program Design | Educator | Educator with help from Client $ED_{cl}$ |
| Sanction and Support | Client | $CL_{ed}$ |
| Program Implementation | Educator | $ED_{cl}$ |
| Evaluation | Client | $CL_{ed}$ |

The Model Cities Program for Education is based specifically on the experiences of the Woodlawn Experimental School Project, but the plan calls for the adding of new functions and for increased coordination. The Model Cities plan calls for coordination of the educational programs of the public and parochial schools. The expansion of educational services would include a pre-school center, a career vocational institute, and a "fluid school" which would rely heavily on a variety of different kinds of educators, such as trained parents, older peer group students, and other non-education professionals.

## 6. Economic Development

A major feature of the Model Cities plan and one in which there has not been much previous involvement on the part of the University of Chicago is in the area of economic development. It is estimated that at least 10,000 persons in a total potential Woodlawn work force of 35,000 need significant amounts of help. The idea of relying primarily on black entrepreneurs was discounted because that couldn't develop enough jobs. If there is substantial construction in the physical redevelopment of the Woodlawn area, this will provide a number of construction jobs. Many black people are already at work in the manpower training program and the rehabilitation of school facilities involved in the Woodlawn Experimental School Project. The Woodlawn Organization has participated in many federal and local employment programs by providing recruitment, selection, support and education services. As a community organization with an extensive block organization, it holds a comparative advantage in outreach and follow-up activities on the job front. The plan calls for the education system playing a major role in preparing people for meaningful employment.

Arthur Brazier of The Woodlawn Organization is well aware that economic development and the securing of jobs is a difficult area which often involves conflict with the white power structure. In his estimate it was the white power structure both within the City of Chicago and the

United States Senate that brought to a halt one of the most promising manpower training programs that The Woodlawn Organization started.

With funding from the Office of Economic Opportunity at the rate of approximately $1 million a year The Woodlawn Organization started a program aimed at training gang members for meaningful employment. A prerequisite to the securing of the grant was The Woodlawn Organization's bringing about a truce between the two gangs--the Blackstone Rangers and the Eastside Disciples. The City administration blocked the appointment of the project director that The Woodlawn Organization wanted and the police harassed the project throughout its year of existence. The press made sensational statements about the criminal involvement of some of the members of the project and the McClelland Committee (the Senate Sub-Committee on Investigations) held public hearings on the project and brought such pressure to bear on the Office of Economic Opportunity that the project was not refunded.

Although the University was not formally involved in either the drafting of the proposal or the operation of the program, it offered strong support to The Woodlawn Organization in an effort to keep the program going. Julian Levy attempted to get Mayor Daley to back the program. Irving Spergel of the School of Social Service Administration evaluated the program and defended it strongly.

## Summary

The University has become involved in a number of programs in the Woodlawn area and each has been reshaped to meet the specific needs of the people of Woodlawn. Initial hostility between the University of

Chicago and The Woodlawn Organization has been replaced by a working relationship where The Woodlawn Organization calls the shots and the University of Chicago supplies the expertise and sometimes the resources. The University of Chicago's rationale for having become involved in these projects was not simply to provide services, but rather to learn about new methods of delivering services. The desire of The Woodlawn Organization to draw up a new Model Cities program allowed the experiences of a number of separate units to be distilled into a comprehensive program that has wide applicability for other universities and other cities.

This brief description of what has transpired in Woodlawn has not been intended to give the impression that all the hurdles have been passed and that everything in the future will be a success. However, anyone looking at the record cannot fail to be impressed by the large amount that has been accomplished. Key ingredients in this story have been pragmatic, forceful leadership at both the University of Chicago and The Woodlawn Organization.

# REFERENCES

Beadle, Muriel. The Hyde Park-Kenwood Urban Renewal Years: A History to Date. October, 1964.

Brazier, Arthur M. Black Self-determination: The Story of the Woodlawn Organization. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969.

Bruckner, D. J. R. "Unique City Plan Former in Chicago: Black Community's Leaders Will Seek Approval by Daley." The Los Angeles Times, Friday, November 29, 1968.

Congreve, Willard J. "The Woodlawn Experiment: Unique Collaboration." Compact (April, 1969), p. 22.

Gunther, John. "Chicago Revisited." Chicago Today, Vol. II, No. 1 (1965).

Levi, Julian H. "The Influence of Environment on Urban Institutions." Educational Record (April, 1961), pp. 137-141.

________. "The Neighborhood Program of the University of Chicago." Prepared for the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for inclusion in a casebook. August, 1961.

________. "The Greatest Domestic Challenge." Chicago Today, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Summer, 1968), pp. 2-8.

Nash, George and Patricia Nash. "Leads Columbia Could Have Followed." New York, June 3, 1968. Reprint No. A-549, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.

Rossi, Peter H. and Robert A. Dentler. The Politics of Urban Renewal: The Chicago Findings. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Schiff, Sheldon K. "Community Accountability and Mental Health Services." Mental Hygiene, Vol. 54, No. 2 (April, 1970), pp. 205-214.

Swenson, William. The Continuing Colloquium on University of Chicago Demonstration Projects in Woodlawn: Aspects of a Major University's Commitment to an Inner-city Ghetto. Report prepared for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Chicago: Center for Urban Studies, 1968.

U.S., Commission on Civil Rights. T.W.O.'s Model Cities Plan. Clearinghouse Publication, Urban Series No. 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

Williams, Eddie N. (ed.) Delivery Systems for Model Cities: New Concepts in Serving the Urban Community. Chicago: Center for Policy Study and Center for Urban Studies, The University of Chicago, 1969.

* * *

# COLUMBIA:
# TURNING THE UNIVERSITY AROUND

Robert Price

# COLUMBIA: TURNING THE UNIVERSITY AROUND

In 1775, when Columbia University was still King's College of Wall Street, a mob of local townspeople marched on the campus seeking the neck of Columbia's President Miles Cooper, a known Tory sympathizer. While undergraduate Alexander Hamilton kept the angry crowd at bay, Cooper in his nightshirt scurried out the back window down to the Hudson River. The next day he boarded ship for England, never to return. Columbia and its Presidents have been running from the city ever since.

Franklin H. Williams, when he assumed the post of Director of Columbia's Urban Center, described his task as no less than to "turn the University around." While able to halt to some degree the University's retreat, the Urban Center and the coincidental student revolt have hardly accomplished such wide-sweeping goals.

This chapter will first trace the history of Columbia's retreat from the city and its attempt to rebuild its neighborhood in its own image of a suitable academic environment. The major portion of the discussion will center on the formation of an Urban-Minority Affairs Center as a result of a $10 million grant from the Ford Foundation. The degree to which this Center has succeeded in halting Columbia's retreat and forcing the University into recognizing its responsibility to the community will be analyzed in some detail. Specific university and community programs will be discussed.

## Retreat from the City

Columbia's institutional retreat from New York City began in 1857 when the College abandoned its buildings on the grounds of Trinity Episcopal Church and moved north to the site of what is now Rockefeller

Center. The city soon caught up with the College, prompting another move uptown in 1897. The site chosen was a plateau in uptown Manhattan known as Morningside Heights. The "last escape" seemed to guarantee the College, now officially a University, an "academic" atmosphere. Columbia, "crowned and set upon a height" as the Alma Mater sings, was to become "the Acropolis of the Hudson."

Unfortunately, the Columbia Trustees were not sufficiently far-sighted to purchase the entire Heights for University usage. Faced with an almost unlimited amount of land available at nominal cost, they settled for a 16 square block area. Still in 1914 Columbia's historian Frederick Keppel could write: "One of our valued academic possessions is the fine view from the President's house over Morningside Park, across the city, and to the hills of Long Island." The advancing city soon spoiled the President's view. The residential neighborhod witnessed the rapid process of urban evolution and decay. Other institutions began to move into the area. By 1947 the 14 institutions on the Heights found it necessary to form an organization, Morningside Heights, Incorporated. (M.H. Inc.) to "promote the improvement of Morningside Heights as an attractive residential, educational, and cultural area." M.H.Inc. employed a uniformed street patrol largely financed by Columbia and ran some small community service programs. M.H. Inc. also sponsored the construction of Morningside Gardens, a 1,000-unit middle-income housing development and Grant Houses, a 2,000-unit low-income project, removing two blighted areas to the north of the Heights.[14]

As an educational institution Columbia was also undergoing change during this period. Before 1900 the student body was drawn largely from the professional and upper middle class of New York society. In the 1900's the College began to attract the intellectually ambitious and professionally oriented children of New York immigrant families, particularly Jewish. Since World War II, however, the student body had come to have a distinctly national character.[1a] The traditional classical curriculum began to give way at Columbia as early as 1792, when professorships of economics, natural history and French were established, but tradition died hard as Latin was maintained as an entrance requirement until 1916. The "irrelevancy" of the classical curriculum in the mid 1900's almost deprived the College of students and revenue; a $140,000 gift of the state saved Columbia.[6] A far greater threat to the College was the growing trend toward professionalism which called into question the necessity for four-year institutions. The college survived the challenge, however, thanks to the concept of general education. The introduction of a General Honors course on "great books" and a Contemporary Civilization course in 1917 represented Columbia's commitment to the concept that "there is a certain minimum of ...(the Western) intellectual and spiritual tradition that a man must experience and understand if he is to be called educated."[6] General education dominated the College without a break until 1954, when a majors system was introduced.[1a] The College was able to maintain its existence, despite its small size (2,700) in the midst of a large university (17,000) which annually awarded more Ph.D.'s than any other in the nation. The College remained an elite school, one in which 90% of its graduating class goes directly into professional or postgraduate education.

The needs of a large university and the deterioration of the community led to conflict, which was described by the Faculty Civil Rights Group which described some of the history of the encounter in 1967. Columbia Provost Jacques Barzun described the neighborhood as "uninviting, abnormal, sinister, and dangerous." Of particular concern to the University was the existence of SRO's: hotel-like conversions of former apartment buildings, legally classified as Single Room Occupancies. The SRO's had become principal housers of "deteriorated people," as Columbia planner Stanley Salmen called them. For example, the Bryn Mawr Hotel on 121st Street, when demolished in 1964, housed 90 relief clients, many of whom were alcoholics, addicts and prostitutes, according to a study done by the Columbia School of Social Work. Columbia proclaimed its intent to rid the neighborhood of a source of crime and to restore the neighborhood to its previous condition. Unable to flee the city any longer, Columbia decided to remake it in its own image. Salmen is quoted by the Civil Rights Group as saying: "We are looking for a community where the faculty can talk to people like themselves. We don't want a dirty group." Suggestions that Columbia might take the approach of instituting social service programs rather than removing SRO tenants were rejected. Since renewal of the neighborhood would primarily mean removing blacks, whose population had increased 700% from 1950 to 1960, and Puerto Ricans, whose number on the Heights had doubled, sensitive racial issues were involved.

The process of removal went on effectively, as 6,700 of the 9,600 SRO tenants were removed between 1960 and 1968, reversing the population trends of the previous decade. Columbia described its success in "cleaning and restoring" the Heights:

> Self-styled political leaders and other quarrelsome elements, often finding allies among professional politicians, have done much to impede the renewal plan. But Morningside Heights has been cleaned up anyway and is now one of the safer parts of the city. All but two SRO's have been eliminated and nobody really regrets their passing. 12

What most upset the "self-styled political leaders" was Columbia's failure to abide by urban renewal guidelines. In response to a study sponsored by M.H., Inc. the City submitted to the Federal government the Morningside Heights General Neighborhood Renewal Plan (GNRP), planned and revised over the years 1959-1964. Columbia, unhappy with the plan because it did not fulfill the University's desire to have no SRO's or public housing between 110th Street and 123rd Street, accelerated its purchase of buildings before the GNRP could be approved. In January 1965 the GNRP was approved and a map issued supposedly showing the limits of institutional expansion. Columbia within four months had purchased an SRO outside the limits of the plan. As of September 1968, 58 of the 309 residential buildings in the neighborhood had been demolished, emptied, or converted for institutional use. Twenty of these were outside the limits of the map.[2]

Although non-profit institutions were not required to provide any relocation services or grants to displaced tenants, Columbia, in January 1963, formed an Office of Neighborhood Services to, as its first director said, "polish up its tarnished image." The tarnish was hardly removed by the actions of the University to evict tenants who were reluctant to vacate. Holdouts were offered stipends in addition to regular relocation grants if they moved immediately. Rents were increased 25% in one SRO to, as Columbia phrased it, "encourage the few people who were still there to leave." Occasionally building services and building security were allowed to deteriorate as an additional "inducement" to vacate. Extensive harassment took place at some dwellings, including surprise police raids and the plugging of keyholes while the resident was away.[12,14]

Columbia failed to correct these abuses, despite a penetrating report by the Faculty Civil Rights Group in December 1967. Thoroughly documenting Columbia's past policies, the group stated, "Institutional expansion combines the worst dangers of urban renewal with a complete absence of renewal's advantages and safeguards." The committee emphasized the need for an overall master plan for institutional expansion and made four recommendations: 1) Efforts be instituted to revive an economically and ethnically integrated and balanced community on Morningside Heights; 2) Housing planning to incorporated the idea of mixed community-faculty-student dwellings; 3) Community service programs to be initiated by the University; 4) Community representatives be involved in the planning and operating stages of the above.[12]

The Gym

The resentment which the community felt toward Columbia's expansion policies became focussed on one issue: the gym. For two decades Columbia had contemplated building a new gymnasium to replace its antiquated, cramped facility located underneath the Uris Hall Business School. In 1959 definite plans were drafted. An $11.6 million Columbia-community gym was to be erected on a steep rocky slope at the south end of Morningside Park. The gym would occupy 2.1 acres of the 30-acre Park which separates the Heights from Harlem. The Columbia facility was anticipated to cost $10 million, the separate community portion $1.6 million. Columbia was to construct the community gym and pay for all athletic equipment and staff supervision of the community gym. The University's estimate of annual heating costs alone for the community facility was $75,000. The gym would be open all year without fee.

On the whole the plan met with enthusiastic endorsement. The city had in recent years poured $500,000 into Morningside Park, which it had first taken over in 1870. Despite this the Park was still labeled by police as a "very to extremely hazardous" area and an area of "light public use." The Park was rarely used by persons in the community, especially at night. It was a notorious hangout for muggers, and one of the world's largest narcotics traffic centers was located on its fringes. One of the few distinguishing monuments in the Park is Edgar Walton's "Bear and Fawn Fountain," but no one can ever remember seeing water in it. The only area of real use in the Park was the Columbia-Community Playground at the south end of the Park, opened in 1957 after Columbia spent $250,000 to reclaim the land and construct the playing field and small field house. Two thousand five hundred teenagers in organized teams took part in baseball, touch football, and track programs run by Columbia. The Playground was constructed by Columbia for the community and leased back to Columbia for University use during the academic year.

Many community leaders heralded Columbia's gymnasium plan as a landmark in university-community cooperation. Little or no opposition was voiced as the plan cleared necessary approval from the Mayor, the Board of Estimate, the City Council, the Municipal Arts Commission, two successive Parks Commissioners, both houses of the State Legislature, and the Governor. In order to lease park land to Columbia the City had to go through the New York State Legislature. In 1959 enabling legislation was passed by the State Assembly and State Legislature; it was signed into law by Governor Nelson Rockefeller on April 14, 1960. The lease which called for Columbia to pay $3,000 a year rent was approved by the Board of Estimate after a public hearing on July 27, 1961. In August 1961 Columbia signed a one-hundred-year lease with the City.

Because of a shortage of funds Columbia was unable to begin immediate construction of the gym. In fact, the deadline for groundbreaking--after which the University would find the lease invalidated--was postponed several times. During the delay opposition began to develop. Both new Parks Commissioners under Mayor John Lindsay opposed the plan; they felt the community was getting too little out of the deal. The mood and level of political sophistication in the Harlem community was also undergoing drastic changes during this period. Columbia's administration was insensitive to this. As the student documenters of the student revolt phrased it. "The gym...was in the best tradition of white liberal aid to the disadvantaged...The Columbia administration and Trustees could not understand that now paternalistic liberalism was no longer wanted."[1] In response to community pressure Columbia altered its plans and on October 25, 1967 announced that it was adding a community swimming pool to the facility, raising the community position of the gym from 12.5% to 15%. Opponents still demonstrated again "gym crow" even after groundbreaking began. H. Rap Brown appeared before a community group and urged them that if the gym were constructed they should "blow it up...burn it down." Columbia said that "construction of the gym is now a fait accompli."

And so it appeared until the student demonstration of April 1968. The first student demand acceded to by the University was a suspension of construction on the gym. After a year of consultation with the community which revealed majority support for the gym but enough opposition to create serious problems, the Trustees abandoned plans for the gym in the Park.[7] Columbia claimed to have lost $5 million, the cost of terminating construction after contracts had been signed. In addition, much haggling with the City followed over who would pay for rehabilitation of the construction site, which still remains as a gaping hole.

A Declining University

Gaping holes were in evidence at numerous other points of Columbia's life. Christopher Jencks and David Reisman described Columbia in not too complimentary terms in The Academic Revolution:[4] "Its leadership is bankrupt, its location dysfunctional, and its faculty deteriorating." The leadership problem was one of both structure and personality. During the 42-year (1902-1945) tenure of President Nicholas Murray Butler, Columbia's administration was centralized in the hands of one man--Butler. His charismatic leadership single-handedly built Columbia into a great university--but at great expense, for no alumni fund-raising mechanisms and no cohesive university structure were created. During Butler's declining years and during the weak Presidencies of Dwight D. Eisenhower and Grayson Kirk, the University moved to a decentralized structure. Each of the divisions of the University was its own fiefdom, with its own fund-raising program. This led to the enrichment of schools with great alumni loyalty and the impoverishment of others. The Cox Commission Report compared the "new and well-equipped professional school buildings with the old and inadequate structures that house the College and Graduate Facilities."[2, p.33]

Leadership problems pervaded the institution. The intemperate language of Columbia's planner Stanley Salmen, who often was the University's representative to the community, has been reported previously. Provost Jacques Barzun and Vice-Provost Herbert Deane often expressed themselves in the way most likely to alienate community and students. Kirk himself was a weak leader. A student slogan ran: "Butler reigned and ruled. Ike reigned but did not rule. Kirk neither reigns nor rules."[1,2]

If the administration were isolated from the educational situation and the community, the 24 Trustees were even more so. That self-perpetuating body was composed of a homogeneous elite of banking executives, real estate brokers, communications and mass media leaders and utilities executives. No scholars, no artists, no blacks, no women, no labor leaders, no former public servants were on the Board. The Trustees' average age was over 60.[13]

Columbia's academic standing had begun to drop. Faculty salaries, according to the AAUP ratings, had dropped in national ranking over the period 1963-1964 to 1967-1968 from 5th to 9th to 15th to 12th to 17th. A 1966 study by the American Council on Education showed that Columbia's graduate programs, which in 1957 were among the top three in the nation, ranked consistently below 5th. In April 1967 the Ford Foundation omitted Columbia from the ten universities to which it granted $41.5 million for restructuring doctoral programs, stating that Columbia "lacked motivation for reform."[2]

Some changes had begun to be made at Columbia. The middle administrative level was particularly weak because the Columbia structure had but one Vice-President and 31 deans. In 1967 a major administrative shake-up removed Jacques Barzun from the position of Provost and replaced him with David B. Truman, a man of similarly solid academic credentials and a history as Dean of the College of rapport with students and alumni. A number of Vice-Presidents were named to bolster the middle administrative level. Many felt that Truman was being groomed for the Presidency.

The administrative shakeup did not prevent new problems. For instance, there was the Strickman affair. Dr. Robert Strickman, a free-lance chemist, claimed to have perfected a cigarette filter far superior to any other on the market. Partly to benefit the University and mostly to establish credibility for his invention, he agreed to turn over all rights to it to Columbia. Columbia enthusiastically accepted and announced the agreement with great fanfare in July 1967. This was a questionable move coming at a time when the Surgeon General was engaged in a massive campaign against cigarette smoking as a health hazard. But even worse was the fact that Columbia had not even tested the filter. Later tests revealed the filter to be practically worthless. Columbia eventually surrendered its interest and the Trustees issued the following meek statement: "The University feels that it owes it to the public to state candidly that it made a well-intentioned mistake in entering a highly controversial and competitive commercial field."[5]

Truman was by association implicated in this affair. Truman became the spokesman for the University and thus identified with Kirk in the students revolt of 1968. Truman soon followed Kirk in departure from Columbia after the crisis--Kirk to retirement, Truman to the Presidency of Mt. Holyoke College. A reknowned diplomat, Andrew Cordier became Columbia's Acting President and later, when several candidates -- Martin Meyerson, John Gardner, and Alexander Heard -- among them -- refused the job, Cordier became President. Eventually, William McGill, Chancellor of the San Diego branch of the University of California, was named President.

Ford's Line of Credit

On November 1, 1966, Columbia, having rejected five year's earlier the idea of a centralized campaign, embarked on the largest fund drive ever announced by a university - a $200 million, three-year effort. Kicking off the drive was a $35 million grant from the Ford Foundation, the largest single-institution grant ever made by that organization. Twenty-five million dollars was on a four-to-one matching basis; the remaining $10 million was designated for the "establishment of a broad new program in urban and minority affairs."

In announcing the grant, Ford President McGeorge Bundy indicated the $10 million could be used for projects ranging from "special research appointments" to "experimental action in ghetto communities." The Ford grant was apparently unexpected and unsolicited by the University. There seemed to be confusion from the outset on how the money should be spent. Dr. Kirk maintained that the program would be "likely to make a greater contribution in terms of research and training than in terms of direct action." Champion Ward, Vice-President of Ford, emphasized both "action projects in the surrounding community" and work within the University for "improved understanding and training" in the field of urban-minority problems. While Columbia announced no plans for the inclusion of community leaders in discussions, Ford indicated that such community participation was expected. But, Ward said, "We feel this is something for Columbia's initiative." While Kirk said that a major role of the money would be the coordination of current university programs in urban affairs, Ward stressed the establishment of new activities rather than "merely the traditional notion of doing a good job of what you are already doing."

Columbia's first step after accepting the grant was to appoint a five-man Advisory Committee and a 24-man Advisory Council. All of these people were from the University; except for two student members of the Council, all were professors. No community representatives and no minority representatives were named. Heading the Committee was General Studies Dean Clarence Walton, later named Interim Director of the Center for Urban-Minority Affairs.

The Committee commissioned two studies, one an inventory of Columbia's existing activities in the area,[9] the other a study of programs at Harvard, Yale, Chicago, Penn, and Michigan.[8] The Columbia survey reported:

> Columbia College, General Studies, and the Graduate Faculties are probably unique among comparable components of major universities in the almost total omission of urban and minority issues from their curricula.

Only one course in each of the undergraduate divisions was considered relevent to the area. The survey concluded:

> It follows that any serious increase of instructional offerings related to urban and minority problems would require the recruitment of new faculty members with appropriate qualifications and interests.

Some of the professional schools, particularly Social Work and Public Health, were given much better ratings. Others, like the Law School, which introduced a course in "The Law and the Poor" only in 1967, fared nearly as badly as the undergraduate schools.[9]

Student field work was another area inventoried. Only at the School of Social Work was course credit given for student work in the community. That this had not received much thought at Columbia did not surprise anyone who had read Daniel Bell's book The Reforming of General Education, a Carnegie-funded year-long effort to study the Columbia curriculum and suggest changes. Only one paragraph[1a] of the 300 plus page book is devoted to "action programs" or "work programs" as a part of the educational experience of students. The Columbia College Citizenship Program was singled out as one of the most meaningful involvements of the University in the community. Founded in 1957 the program soon became one of the largest college volunteer programs in the country. In 1965-66 1,100 volunteers were involved; in 1966-67 the number increased to 1,600. In the last few years the Cit Council reflected the changing mood in the student population at Columbia. The Council began to get more involved in radical politics, and the number of volunteers dropped to 550 in 1968-69. When Columbia students called a strike in the spring of 1967, the governing board of Cit Council voted not to take a stand on this political issue. A minority of the board, however, offered the Council offices to the SDS-led Strike Committee as an information headquarters. This polarized the Council and led, in December 1968, to the "liberals," who felt that students could still provide meaningful service to ghetto communities, "dissolving" the Cit Council and establishing themselves as the Columbia-Barnard Community Service Council. Along with the liberals went 400 of the 550 volunteers and the program's paid director Roderick Derkin. The "radicals," who felt "political" issues to be the order of the day, and the "liberals"eventually came to an agreement on division of facilities and budget, and both programs continued in operation.

In addition to curriculum and student field work, the Columbia survey looked at "basic research," which was defined broadly as "any inquiry designed to contribute to public knowledge about urban and minority problems or to uncover general principles useful in solving them." The study concluded, "Even by this flexible criterion, there is little to be counted at Columbia at present." The Columbia Council for Research in the Social Sciences, whose grants support the personal, long-term research interests of the faculty, approved 24 projects for 1966-67, only one having anything to do with New York or local minorities. In the area of "applied research," the University came out somewhat better with the Schools of Social Work, Law, and Architecture and the Bureau of Applied Social Research leading the way.[9]

Following these initial studies, the Advisory Committee undertook to draw up a report, which was completed in mid-June of 1967.[10] In preparing the report, the Committee claimed to have consulted many University departments, governmental officials, and over 200 representatives of the Harlem community. However, only a month before the report was completed, the three student members of the Advisory Council resigned, denouncing the Committee as "a sham." The Council had had only three meetings in five months, took no votes, reached no decisions and had drawn up the report, keeping no minutes of its meetings which could be presented to the whole Council. Nonetheless, on October 29, 1967, the "first phase" of Columbia's Urban-Minority Affairs program was announced, employing $2.7 million of the Ford line of credit.

The report introduced to the public three pilot programs, supported by an allocation of $180,170, which had received advance approval and were already in operation. One was a program conducted by the School of Social Work and the St. Luke's Hospital Community Psychiatry Division to provide the first Columbia-supported social service program for residents of single-room occupancy buildings. A second pilot program involved 35 Columbia law students in work with specific legal problems of Harlem poor. The third was a grant to the ten-year-old program for Effective Justice of the School of Law to study protection of the poor against malpractices in the collection of small debts and the eviction of tenants.

The largest single program grant announced was $600,000 to Teachers College to improve Harlem schools and to develop educational leadership in the community. Professor Francis A. J. Ianni was placed in charge, and the exact specifications of the program were not outlined. Teachers College officials admitted that an allocation of such a sum without specific project plans was "unusual." The Committee had originally recommended a $350,000 program to transform an existing Harlem school into a community school directly operated by Columbia and the Harlem community. The "multiple" approach program, as opposed to this "single school" approach, was expected to involve 50 students with 10 different school-community groups. Also to be expanded was the work of the East Harlem Community Resource Center, a clearinghouse for community educational groups.

Another major beneficiary of Ford's largess was the Institute of Urban Environment of the School of Architecture which received $179,000 for a detailed analysis of Harlem housing needs. Another $430,000 went to five new projects: 1) the creation of an Industrial and Commercial Development Association involving Harlem business leaders, the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity, and faculty from the Graduate School of Business and the Economics Department; 2) the creation of a Development Division to seek out, enroll, and give special training for professional andtechnical jobs to minority adults who do not meet Columbia's admission standards; 3) efforts by a group of doctors from Harlem Hospital to train community people to be medical laboratory assistants, labor and delivery room technicians, and technical nursing assistants: 4) efforts to enlarge cooperation between the School of Arts and various cultural groups in Harlem; 5) emergency action to save 5,000 items in the Schomberg Collection of Negro history, literature and art which were in danger of physical deterioration.

The principal recommendation of the Committee report was the creation of a Center for Urban-Minority Affairs to coordinate and evaluate all of these programs. It was established with an initial allocation of $111,500 and a $500,000 fund to provide doctoral fellowships in Negro history and urban problems. Further, a $250,000 endowment was set up to insure a place in the University for the Center after the Ford money was exhausted. A director was to be appointed to report directly to the President. The

Committee recommended that he be given professorial rank with tenure. Two Associate Directors were to be named: one for community programs and one for urban-minority studies. The former was to be a post "significantly different from traditional University assignments" and was to be filled by someone who was to know Harlem through working with the community in non-academic ways. The latter was to be a man of "scholarly attainments."[10]

Columbia's search for personnel to fill these positions revealed some significant modifications of the recommendations. The staff, and ultimately the Urban Center office itself, took on a distinctly Peace Corps flavor. The Director was appointed on March 7, 1968--Franklin H. Williams, former regional administrator for Africa of the Peace Corps and, at the time of his appointment, U.S. Ambassador to Ghana. Williams hardly seemed to fit the criteria suggested by the Advisory Committee. He was not a Ph.D. and did not, therefore, receive a faculty appointment, much less tenure. Although black and a native New Yorker, his experience for the preceding five years had been in Africa. "Frank is just out of touch with the ghetto," one critic commented. In December 1968, Roger S. Kuhn, formerly Williams' deputy in the Peace Corps administration in Africa, was named Deputy Director of the Center. At the time of his appointment, he was a professor of law at George Washington University, specializing in poverty law. Ewart Guinier, a veteran of community involvement in the Jamaica section of Queens, was named Associate Director. Significantly, Guinier's post was made inferior to Kuhn's, despite the recommendation by the Committee that they be equivalent.

Williams, in a November press conference, described the Center's job as "to turn the University around." He made it clear, however, that the Ford grant was not designed to make Columbia an administrator of "an anti-poverty program in Harlem." He reported having found in the community "suspicion as to who I am and why I am here" and "an impression that Columbia bought themselves a colored boy to solve problems. They will be sadly mistaken," he said. He then proceeded to outline a role for the Urban Center as a "catalyst for change." Community programs were to be funded when they were community-initiated and involved Columbia faculty, students, or facilities. Columbia would use the Ford funds as "seed money."

The effectiveness of the Urban Center in "turning the University around" is questionable. The Center divided its activities into four areas: 1) Curriculum Development; 2) Minority Recruitment and Funding; 3) Research; 4) Community programs. In each area, limited successes were met and problems developed.

## Curriculum Development

A year after the initial allocation for action projects, Ford granted $1.8 million to endow three chairs in the Graduate Faculties in the fields of urban economics, sociology, and history and government. Some questions were raised as to the appropriateness of this kind of use of money designated for "urban-minority" affairs. Community leaders felt the money should have gone for community projects. Some in the University felt that rather than merely setting up a chair, money should have been set aside to provide these new professors with research staff so that they might make a greater impact on the University.

These questions, however important, are secondary to the mystery as to why Columbia has taken so long to find persons to fill the chairs. Only one of the three chairs has been filled. In September 1969, Charles V. Hamilton, co-author with Stokely Carmichael of the book Black Power, assumed a professorship in the Government Department. Internal faculty politics effectively prevented other appointments. In the spring of 1969 the Urban Center, after an unsuccessful search for a black urban sociologist, announced the appointment of the respected Herbert J. Gans to the second Ford chair. The Sociology faculty, angered that it had not been involved in the selection process, prevented the appointment. At about the same time, Harold Cruse, author of The Crisis of the Black Intellectual, was being considered for the history chair. According to members of the History faculty, the tenured department members with the cooperation of Frank Williams vetoed Cruse as too radical. History has since appointed two black professors--Hollis Lynch and Nathan I. Huggins, but neither was named to the Ford chair.

Perhaps the most ambitious project of the Urban Center was the 1968-69 Curriculum Project, a complete report on curriculum, current and planned, dealing with urban and minority affairs, with recommendations for additions and improvement. Dr. Joseph G. Colmen, former Director of Research for the Peace Corps and Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW, was hired to direct the study. The study accumulated several volumes of material. A survey of students was conducted by the Bureau of Applied Social Research; the community was surveyed by a Harlem-based body, the Community Educational Associates. The report, entitled, "The Human Uses of the University," was submitted to the University in November 1969.[21] Its recommendations were sweeping. It called for the establishment of a School of National Studies to coordinate a comprehensive degree program in Urban Studies and Ethnic Studies and to administer a wide range of community service projects.

The Report stated that a School was structurally desirable because it would have its own budget, its own faculty and faculty loyalty, its own degrees. It would be easier under that structure to cross disciplinary lines and to avoid duplication. The School would have departments of Ethnic Studies and Urban Studies. The former would provide for: 1) an undergraduate major in Afro-American Studies; 2) an undergraduate survey course in Afro-American Studies for non-majors; 3) undergraduate courses in Puerto Rican Studies; 4) a graduate program in Afro-American studies; 5) a Department of American Intercultural Studies, providing an interdisciplinary approach to issues of ethnicity and race relations; 6) a Student Cultural Center. The Urban Studies Department would carry on the same kind of program with field work integrated into the curriculum. Also suggested was a Collegium of the City, a one-year experimental college program for selected students in the above departments.

To coordinate the programs of the School with the community, an Ethnic and Urban Research, Information, and Community Center would be set up to provide consultative services to community programs and to mediate conflicts. To coordinate the programs of the School with those of other University divisions, the Report recommended a University-wide Council on Urban and Ethnic Affairs.[21]

The Curriculum Report met immediate resistance. Columbia's black student organizations criticized it for treating "the cultural and physical survival of black people as a mere abstract and theoretical issue." The student newspaper, however, offered its endorsement. The administration response was less enthusiastic. President Cordier estimated that instructional salaries alone for the School would amount to $1.5 million per year. Vice-President for Administration Warren F. Goodell, said this would mean some other division of the University would have to be eliminated. Provost Peter B. Kenen said, "The School would cost more money than we have for the whole University program...I don't think you'll see the School for National Affairs here." Further action on the Curriculum Report apparently awaits the arrival of new President McGill.

Some positive steps were taken in the curriculum area, despite the lack of action on these major recommendations. In March 1969 Columbia College offered its first black history class. That development was not without problems, as the black students walked out on the white instructor early in the term. Money from the Urban Center brought in black guest lecturers and saved the course, although the white instructor continued in charge through 1969-70. The School of General Studies started in 1968-69 an interdisciplinary major in urban studies, and Barnard began in 1969-70 a similar program involving 30 students. The committee on Instruction of the College approved such a program in April 1970.

Two of the divisions of the University which were most progressive in adopting curricular programs relevant to urban problems were the School of Architecture and the School of Social Work. Architecture's most outstanding program was the East Harlem Urban Planning Studio, now the Community Development and Planning Studio.[17] Formed in the spring of 1968 in cooperation with the Real Great Society, an indigenous youth movement working primarily with educational programs, this program provided a way for students, principally in the Urban Planning Division of the School, to be involved in actual planning activities rather than classroom-simulated projects, which often successfully simulate physical design problems but miss political, economic and social factors. Among the projects students were involved in for course credit were: 1) planning and design of a storefront community center, 2) planning a real estate management and maintenance training institute for East Harlem, 3) establishing a six-week course in cost estimating for 33 members of a Harlem-based professional association of minority contractors, 4) design of an Intra-Area Transit System for East Harlem consisting of two jitney-bus loops to be community-owned and operated, 5) publication of a procedural handbook on the reuse of vacant buildings, storefronts, and lots for use by community groups, 6) design of a plaza and festival center in an East Harlem marketing area, 7) assisting in the establishment of a community center to train residents for jobs in the printing trades. By February 1969 it could be reported that 25% of the students in the School were working with community groups.

The School of Social Work, founded in 1904 and affiliated with Columbia since 1940, has been by nature involved in urban minority affairs. As Dean Samuel Finestone remarks, "There is not a single class we give which is not related to the urban crisis. That's what our profession is about when we are in the city." The School has been one of the leaders in shifting the focus of social work training from the caseworker approach to the community organization approach. Mobilization for Youth, the real father of the anti-poverty program, began at Columbia. A 1968 student strike at the soon-to-be-abandoned Carnegie Mansion campus of the School, led to even more rapid movement, as students gained almost equal representation on curriculum committees. (Among the places of impact of this student involvement has been in in broadening the concept of field placement.) Community organizing students were placed in two non-traditional organizations: Local 1199 of the Drug and Hospital Workers Union and the national office of COPE. With grants from the Urban Center and the Carnegie Corporation, a Leadership Cadre Program was begun in 1968, providing scholarships and stipends for three blacks and three Puerto Ricans recommended by community organizations to undertake a two-year program in community organizing leading to an M.S.W.[18]

Other divisions of the University, such as Law and Teachers College have begun to move in this area, although not nearly as deeply as Social Work and Architecture. The latter division particularly is still in the process of finding out what is going on in its program and putting it together into a cohesive urban education program.

## Minority Recruitment and Funding

In December 1969 the Urban Center under the leadership of Richard Thornell issued a Report on the Center's work in support of increased minority student enrollment.[22] It painted an ambiguous picture of University progress. Throughout the whole University, minority enrollment had increased from 4.9 percent to 6.8 percent. In several divisions of the University, little progress had been made. The Engineering School showed an increase of only two students out of 700. There were no minority students at all in the School of Dentistry; only three of 250 Nursing School students were minority. The College of Physicians and Surgeons accepted only four of 40 black applicants in its class of 132, leaving its percentage of minority students at 1.8 percent. The School of General Studies, on paper the division that should be most open to minority students, had only 2.7 percent of its degree candidates from minorities. Dean John Bourne explained that the almost total absence of scholarship funds was a major barrier to any serious effort by General Studies to expand minority enrollment.

Three of the most progressive divisions of the University were the schools of Social Work, Architecture, and Journalism. At the School of Social Work, a student strike in the spring of 1970 brought about an administrative commitment to a program of recruiting and financial aid which would raise the percentage of minority students from 10 percent to 33 percent. The School of Architecture in one year raised its minority enrollment from 2.9 percent to 10.4 percent. Urban Center funding for recruiting efforts was a contributory factor.

The Journalism School, in addition to raising its percentage of regular degree program minority students from 8.8 percent to 18.6 percent, conducted a special summer program for minority students which met with great success. In response to the Kerner Commission report which criticized the mass media for its lack of minority employees, the School set up a special program in the summer of 1968 under the direction of Fred W. Friendly, former news director of CBS. Students were given tuition exemption and living stipends or family allowances. The eight-week program in 1968 trained twenty men and women and the ten-week 1969 program involved 36 persons (out of 125 applicants)--31 black, 4 Puerto Rican, and one Mexican-American. The students, most of whom had been involved in communications, but a number of whom came from unskilled backgrounds, spent half time in class and half time covering stories. All of the graduates found jobs in communications.

Most of the public focus in the area of minority enrollment was on the College. The Student Afro-American Society (SAS) began to demonstrate and work actively in this area after their abortive cooperation with SDS in the student strike of 1968.[1] In April 1969 the College allocated $2500 to cover the expenses of black students on recruiting trips. Progress in the College was slow at first. The number of minority students in the roughly 700-man freshman class was only seven in 1964, increased to 17 in 1965 and 31 in 1966. In 1967 and 1968, the Admissions Office accepted roughly half of the black applicants, as opposed to one-third of the overall applicants. Still, the number of minority freshmen was only 29 in 1968, about four percent. The SAS criticized the administration for racist admissions and financial aid policies. The administration responded that 95 percent of black students were on scholarship as compared with 44 percent overall. Figures supplied by Richard Thornell on the 1968-69 distribution of College Work-Study Program funds and Educational Opportunity Grants tend to support SAS allegations. Assuming that most of the black and Puerto Rican students need financial aid, it is surprising that so few of them received money from these two programs:

| Students receiving funds | Work-study | EOG |
|---|---|---|
| Black | 28 | 19 |
| Puerto Rican | 27 | 15 |
| Indian | 2 | 0 |
| Oriental | 15 | 15 |
| White | 860 | 188 |
| | 932 | 237 |

The College, however, continued to make progress and its projections for 1970-71 show that almost 25 percent of its entering class will be minority, a dramatic two-year increase. Director of Student Interests, Phil Benson, himself black, anticipates that the College increase will be the most significant new development in 1970. The Graduate Faculties, which had only 1.9 percent minority enrollment in 1969, is also anticipated to show great improvement. Otherwise, Benson projects that trends will not be substantially different from that reflected in the 1969 report.

In summary, Richard Thornell, the author of the Urban Center study, admitted that there had been a lot of talk but little significant action. "The Report shows some progress," he said, "but until the University takes a serious look at its current priorities, there will be no major breakthroughs."

The recruiting picture for minority faculty was even less promising than that for students. The Urban Center, under black theater historian Anne Reid, made a systematic effort to locate black Ph.D's and refer them to various departments of the University. She met with deans and department heads to ascertain their needs. Then she tracked down black Ph.D's who had graduated from institutions from which Columbia usually draws its faculty to find out if they were interested in teaching at Columbia. The first year's efforts resulted in about 50 referrals, but internal departmental considerations resulted in few appointments. Two divisions of the University, Law and Business gave up their efforts at recruitment.

Dean William Fry of the Law School said that any black lawyer qualified for the School's faculty can make fifty percent more than Columbia can offer and can be much more in the forefront of social change than in a faculty position.

Research

A wide variety of small research programs were supported by the Urban Center, among the more prominent being research on the impact of law on blacks conducted by Urban Center Fellow Robert L. Carter, former general counsel of the NAACP, and research on public welfare policy conducted by Professors Richard A. Cloward and Frances Piven of the School of Social Work. Only five percent of the Urban Center grants during the period when $6.6 million of the $10 million line of credit was used went to research.[19]

Community Programs

The Urban Center has been involved, directly or indirectly, in a large number of community projects:

1) the Development Division

One of the major recommendations of the original Advisory Committee on the Urban Center was that a Development Division, under the auspices of the School of General Studies, be set up.[10] General Studies became a School in 1947, replacing the Extension Division of the University. The Development Division would, in effect, reactivate the extension concept which had been lost as General Studies began to take on the appearance less of an adult education division and more of an elite undergraduate college. The Division began operation in the summer of 1968 with a program for East Harlem residents in "English as a Second Language." The program soon expanded as a group of anti-poverty workers were provided with training in interview methods, report writing, and record keeping. In the first nine months of operation, 250 adults took part in Development programs.

Indirectly associated with the Development Division has been a program for the upgrading of minority employees. Columbia's history of employment practices has not been a very proud one. Eruptions of dissatisfied workers occurred as early as 1936. A student report by the Citizenship Council in the spring of 1968 documented Columbia's struggle against efforts to unionize non-academic employees.[15] The Transport Workers' Union had represented service and maintenance personnel for many years, but efforts by COPE, SDS, and Local 1199 of the Drug and Hospital Workers Union to organize food service employees and other non-academic workers met with stiff resistance. The administration has been so defensive about this history that Business Manager Joseph P. Nye would not grant the author an interview but required that all questions be submitted in writing. The situation was finally resolved when, in April 1969, the New York State Legislature repealed a statute allowing non-profit institutions to deny their employees the right to unionization.

Wages at Columbia were quite low and, as a result, turnover was high. The Controller's Office, one of the poorest paying, had almost a fifty percent annual turnover rate. According to the Personnel Office, Columbia's salaries at the entry level are comparable with those offered elsewhere in the city, but at the administrative assistant-executive secretary level the University cannot compete. Columbia estimates that about half of its employees in the maintenance through administrative assistant level are minority persons. The Advisory Committee to the Urban Center in its original report recommended that independent of Ford funds, the University undertake in cooperation with other Morningside Heights institutions, a program to make them model employers. Among the recommended steps were more realistic criteria for employment, improved methods of job training, special remedial courses, in-service courses to develop and upgrade skills, improved promotional ladders, and the establishment of employment-related services, such as day care facilities for the children of working mothers.[10]

Faced with a serious shortage of trained workers and the recommendations of the Committee, Columbia hired Warren J. Kynard, a former Army personnel administrator, to develop an educational uplift program. Columbia thus committed itself to the approach of hiring entry-level people and then upgrading their skills. The program was open to all employees with special priority for members of minority groups. No academic requirements were set. Many classes were scheduled during working hours to maximize employee incentive.

By the summer of 1969, 300 persons had graduated from the program; by August 1970 the number had risen to 663. The majority of the students took "English as a Second Language," but courses were also offered in accounting, business English, key punch operation, general mathematics, reading comprehension, stenography, and typing. No guarantee of promotion was offered on completion; promotion was left to the employing department. In addition, Kynard set up a Vestibule Clerical School, taking ten minority women recruited from the State University Urban Center in Manhattan. They attended six weeks of all-day classes, being paid a minimum wage while doing so and being guaranteed a job upon completion. All ten graduated and were employed by Columbia. After a year, nine of the ten were still working. Kynard also set up a workshop for supervisory personnel to sensitize them to the problems of minority employees.

Similar upgrading programs were offered in other University divisions. At the Computer Center the individual efforts of an administrative assistant, Sheila Creith, led to Step Forward, a 19-week program in office skills. She recruited nine other Columbia employees to do the teaching, lobbied with deans and department chairmen for space and equipment, and recruited through 30 community agencies and 50 churches 37 students for the program.

In summary, a number of meaningful steps were taken in this area which had been one of Columbia's less successful ones. As late as the spring of 1970, however, Columbia was still receiving complaints about discrimination in its food service policies. And at the same time, a group called the Day Care Action Coalition was putting great pressure on the University to provide space for free day care for 300 children of Columbia faculty, staff, and students.

2) MBA Management Consultants

The Business School appointed Hughie E. Mills to the position of Assistant Dean for Community Relations, with the Urban Center paying his salary. Among the first things he set up in 1968 was the MBA Management Consultant program to assist black entrepreneurs in Harlem. The program was developed in response to the request of Harlem businessmen, who now compose the program's Board of Directors. Teams of two or three students with a faculty supervisor provided counseling. For example, the first client was Andrew Gainer of the New York Gas and Maintenance Company. His small firm was bogged down because it had no formal accounting system and Gainer himself had to be personally involved in all its operations. Counseling helped get the business systematized and Gainer became the first Vice-President of the Board of Directors. Other clients included a grocery store, which received help in applying for a modernization loan from the Small Business Administration, which led to a doubling of sales.

The program did not start as a learning experience, but became for many of the traditionally conservative Business School students the first actual contact with minority persons. One hundred students were involved, many working as much as 20 hours a week, although maximum payment was $3 an hour for six hours, there was no course credit.

Another program in this area was the opening of a Purchasing Office in Harlem by the University in 1968. Purchasing representative Junius Robinson tried to stimulate University buying from Harlem businessmen, fewer than ten of which were doing any selling to the University. Business Manager Nye said that the Office would attempt to "guide the Harlem businessman through the many channels necessary to deal with as large an institution as this University." Hughie Mills reports that the Office had some success in such areas as detergent sales, furniture buying, and printing. "It has had a healthy psychological impact on racist attitudes here," he adds.

3) The School of the Arts

The School of the Arts, along with General Studies, is the most impoverished division of the University. Like General Studies, it also is a school without much direct contact with the community. Substantial community involvement has been brought about, however, by the Urban Center's financing of a liaison to the community, Barbara Barnes. The Urban

Center provided funds and initiative because, unlike many schools, pressure did not come from students or faculty. Three projects in particular are worthy of mention.

a) A graduate seminar in black culture and a creative writing workshop was set up under the direction of black author John O. Killens. The Urban Center paid his salary. Killens selected 15 community people and five graduate students to participate in the workshop.

b) Twelve technicians from three Harlem theaters took part in a Theater Technical Training program, spending four hours a week in courses on basic carpentry, lighting, and painting and twenty hours divided between projects at their own theaters and at Columbia. The Urban Center provided six stipends, instructors' salaries and materials. It also funded a commissioning of the works performed.

c) The Urban Center provided money for the creation of a Community Film Board. Prior to its creation in January 1969, the Center had funded a film on the Phoenix House drug treatment program, a film on the teaching of black culture in the public schools, and three films entitled "Black Politics in Newark," "The Poor People's Campaign," and "Black Students in the Columbia Disturbance of 1968." The program forced a real confrontation with the School of the Arts, and the Film Board was set up to process all future requests for funds by black filmmakers. The Board had hoped to establish a processing lab, which would have provided a new industry in the community, a new course for students, and would have cut the cost of film making, but the needed $92,000 was not forthcoming. Barbara Barnes feels that these programs have had little impact on the School of the Arts:

> My position has no leverage; my only weapon is moral suasion. Since no money from the School has been involved, it has made no real sacrifice and thus evidenced no real commitment.

4) East Harlem Community Resource Center

The Urban Center has provided assistance for the East Harlem Community Resource Center, established jointly by Teachers College and the community in January 1967. The center is a clearing-house for community educational services, staffed by two members of the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute headed by Francis Ianni. The Center has been involved in tutoring programs, a drama workshop, and a community newspaper. A group of high school students were supervised in a study of housing which received much attention from political leaders. The Center also ran a World of Testing Program for adults to overcome their fear of tests and to give them experience in testing exercises.

5) The Black Heritage series

The CBS network came up with the idea of an educational series on black history. Because of previous work with Columbia, they approached Winston Kirby, Director of the University Office of Radio and Television. At Kirby's suggestion, an advisory panel was set up consisting of eight members and headed by Vincent Harding, Professor of History and Anthropology at Spellman College in Atlanta. Three members of the Columbia faculty, including radical and popular professors James Shenton of History and Terence Hopkins of Sociology, were members. In an unusual step, the non-Columbia members of the panel were paid $100 per meeting.

CBS, making an investment of about $250,000, provided the facilities, the air time, the announcer, the producer, and the cameraman, making efforts to employ minority group technicians. Despite resistance from the Columbia administration, Wyn Kirby was able to get $20,000 from the Urban Center to handle travel expenses and consultant fees. Columbia later agreed to support a person to produce visual aides as might be desired by the lecturers. Further, Ewart Guinier of the Urban Center served the crucial role of mediator between Columbia and the somewhat suspicious advisory board. (The panel was so mistrustful that it hired its own attorney.) The advisory panel set up the course outline and invited the 31 lecturers, each of whom received $250 an hour, about double the going rate for such activity.

By December 1968, most of the 108-part series was completed. On January 2, 1969 a public screening was held, at which time the three non-Columbia black advisory panel members--Vincent Harding, John Hendrik Clarke, and William Strickland issued a letter of protest against CBS. They claimed: 1) the advisory board was consulted on only 25 percent of the production; 2) the black cameraman was used only periodically; 3) a black public relations firm should have been hired to promote the series in the community; 4) the time of airing (9:00 a.m.) was bad; 5) the panel was not consulted about the public screening. The protest was satisfactorily dealt with and the third demand was met, the first time CBS had ever hired a public relations firm for a public service program. Controversy was not ended, however, as Roy Wilkins publicly denounced the program for downplaying the role of the NAACP and for expressing an extreme militant point of view.

Columbia served primarily as the convener and legitimator of the program, although it also gave some money. The faculty of the University was generally cold to the endeavor and gave it no encouragement. Partly this was by design, as Shenton and Hopkins felt the series could be a showcase for young black academics. The problems which later became public had been anticipated in the planning, but were almost impossible to prevent. On the whole, the endeavor was a rather daring gamble by the University, but it involved only a few individuals and hardly reflected a large-scale University commitment.

6) Medical School Programs

In addition to its famed Columbia-Presbyterian Hospital, Columbia became involved in medical services to the community in mid-1962 when it began a program of affiliation with Harlem Hospital, an antiquated facility at 136th Street and Lenox Avenue. The first step was Columbia's staffing of the

Department of Psychiatry, and by December 1966 Columbia held nine affiliation contracts amounting to $8.5 million per year. At that time, almost all department directors were Columbia faculty members, the entire medical staff was from the College of Physicians and Surgeons or the School of Public Health, and the School of Social Work was providing all the social services. The affiliation was not without controversy.

Building on this program, the Urban Center granted $20,000 to start the Harlem Hospital Center School for Assistant Laboratory Technicians. Twenty community people (15 women, 5 men) were trained as inhalation therapists, delivery room technicians, and in other paraprofessional techniques. In an unrelated move, the Urban Center provided $65,000 initial equity for a $3 million, 124-bed nursing home for low income residents near Harlem Hospital.

Summary

Franklin Williams resigned on November 24, 1969 to become head of the Phelps-Stokes Fund. In announcing his resignation, he did not claim to have "turned the University around," but did offer a positive view of where the University was:

> I am convinced that there has developed throughout this institution an increasing sensitivity to the problems of the people who are our neighbors and a spreading desire to be responsive and supportive to them...In my own view the assignment which I undertook in June of 1968 has been fulfilled.

No one could deny that the University had made some changes. Five new trustees were appointed in July 1969, including two blacks, two educators, and a diplomat. Columbia transferred in 1968 at the Urban Center's request, a sizable deposit from a Morningside Heights bank to a Harlem bank. A new, positive approach to physical expansion was clearly in evidence. In April 1968, John D. Telfer, formerly University planner at Michigan, became Assistant Vice-President for Physical Planning, Columbia's first real "planner". The reknowned architectural firm of I.M. Pei and Associates was commissioned to produce Columbia's first real "plan". Pei was given unusual latitude because of the absence of any previous University plan: he was permitted to consult with anyone inside or outside the University. The community developed a trust for Pei--"He's head and shoulders above anyone else in the field in social consciousness," said Telfer. In April 1969, President Cordier issued a policy statement repudiating the University's past policy of opposition to public housing in Morningside Heights.

In the spring of 1970 Pei issued a report proposing complete utilization of the existing campus grounds by construction deeper and higher than previously envisioned, before expanding outward. The controversial gym would be built below ground. Pei also dealt imaginatively with the Pharmacy site, a block north and east of the campus originally purchased for the planned transfer of the Pharmacy School but left hanging because of community opposition.

Pei proposed a high-rise housing unit for dual use by the University and the community. During demolition of part of the block, residents would be relocated in another part of the block. Community rents would be kept at public housing rates, with Columbia people paying a high differential rate. Mrs. Marie Runyon, a tenant leader, remarked, "Pei and his colleagues do give a damn. It's the first time in history that this has happened." Pei's plan was not new for the area, because Teachers College had announced plans in November 1968 for a similar dual-use tower in its expansion northward.

The physical expansion problem was not completely resolved, as Columbia faced a tremondous space crunch due to delayed construction of the School of International Affairs, the move of the School of Social Work to the Heights, condemnation of buildings housing five academic units, and conversion of 88 undergraduate rooms from doubles to singles. The proposed operation of a nuclear reactor, which the Engineering School constructed on the campus, has also elicited community furor over possible hazards. But given Columbia's history, a remarkable amount of movement has been made. Jack Telfer says:

> So much has been so long neglected here that I feel like I'm racing to catch up for three decades. Other universities moved ten or fifteen years ago to build up planning resources and staff. Columbia did not.

Changes in other areas of University life are not so evident as in the planning area. The curriculum study and minority recruitment, two areas Frank Williams felt were the most successful involvements of the Urban Center, have made barely perceptible waves. The community programs have been of varied success, but as Conrad Graves of the Urban Center says, "We have not really been able to change attitudes; rather, we have provided ways for those who were concerned to act. Maybe in the process of their doing things, others will change."

Probably the most valuable contribution of the Urban Center has been a catalytic one. The administrative personnel who have been liaisons between the baronies of the various schools and the Urban Center have provided this catalyst. Some schools, such as Social Work and Journalism, hardly needed a catalyst. Others, such as Arts and General Studies needed primarily money, which the Urban Center did not have. Teachers College needed coordination. Still others, such as Law, Medicine, and Graduate Faculties have not yet figured out what they need.

As for the Urban Center, it faces an uncertain future under new director Lloyd Johnson. The Ford money is almost exhausted, and there is serious doubt that the University will fund it to the level to which it has become accustomed. The catalytic role of the Center is far from complete. Its liaison role is still badly needed. The University cannot expect Ford or any other outside agency to save it again. As far as Columbia is concerned, "to turn around" must now become an intransitive rather than a transitive verb.

# Columbia: Selected References

Books, listed alphabetically

1. Jerry L. Avorn and members of the staff of the *Columbia Daily Spectator*, *Up Against the Ivy Wall*, New York: Atheneum, 1969.

1a. Daniel Bell, *The Reforming of General Education: The Columbia Experience in its National Setting*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

2. The Cox Commission Report, *Crisis at Columbia: Report of the Fact-finding Commission Appointed to Investigate the Disturbances at Columbia University in April and May 1968*, New York: Vintage Books, 1968.

3. Charles Frankel, *Education and the Barricades*, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1968.

4. Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution*, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968.

5. James Ridgeway, *The Closed Corporation*, New York: Random House, 1968.

6. Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

Articles, listed alphabetically

7. George Nash and Cynthia Epstein, "Harlem Views Columbia University," *New York Magazine*, July 8, 1968.

8. George Nash and Patricia Nash, "Leads Columbia Could Have Followed," *New York Magazine*, June 3, 1968.

Unpublished reports, listed chronologically

9. Theodore Caplow, Urban and Minority Problems: A Brief Inventory of Columbia's Current Activities, Report submitted to the University Planning Committee, October 21, 1966.

10. Report of the President's Committee on Urban-Minority Problems, June 15, 1967.

11. The Progress and Promise of Columbia University in the City of New York, Trustees' Report, July, 1967.

12. The Community and the Expansion of Columbia University, A Report of the Faculty Civil Rights Group, December, 1967.

13. Who Rules Columbia? prepared by the North American Congress on Latin America, 1968.

14. Columbia and the Community: Past Policy and New Directions, by Marc Rauch, Bob Feldman, and Art Leaderman, A Report of the Columbia College Citizenship Council Committee for Research, 1968.

15. Columbia and Unions: Past Policy and New Possibilities, by Margery Isaacson, Doris Chrenstein, Elliott Rosen, Seddon R. Savage, and Robert H. Waldman, A Report from the Citizenship Council Committee for Research, 1968.

16. Columbia College Tomorrow, A Special Report prepared by the Association of the Alumni of Columbia College, 1969.

17. Robert Kolodny, The East Harlem Urban Planning Studio: A Report of the First Year, April, 1969.

18. The Columbia School of Social Work, Report for the Years 1967-69 by Sidney Berengarten, Acting Dean, 1969.

19. The Urban Center, Annual Report, June 1969.

20. Nettie Terestman, Report on Black Recruitment and Enrollment and the Urban Center's Involvement, 1969.

21. "The Human Uses of the University." Report of the Urban Center Curriculum Project, November, 1969.

22. "Toward Equal Educational Opportunity in the Urban Setting, Report on the Activities of the Urban Center in Support of Increased Minority Student Enrollment, December, 1969.

***

## MORGAN STATE:
## DEDICATED TO EXCELLENCE AND LEADERSHIP

George Nash

Each of the ten institutions of higher education included in this case study was selected because it had made one or more serious efforts to involve itself in urban, minority and community problems. Each was fairly innovative. Our first visits to Morgan State College, a predominantly black institution in Baltimore, Maryland, led us to feel that the College was somewhat more conservative and traditional than others in our study. When we got to know Morgan State better, however, we realized that it had devised its own solutions to the problems of black people in cities and that these solutions although different than those of predominantly white institutions, were appropriate and successful.

There are three distinct ways in which Morgan State has contributed to the solution of urban, community, and minority group problems:

1. By being a first-rate institution for black people in a white and predominantly racist society. Morgan State is a high quality institution in every way: in its educational and athletic programs, in its imaginative response to students' demand for change, in its physical facilities, in its urban involvement, and perhaps most importantly, in its administration;

2. By being an outstanding educator for black people. For twenty years Morgan State has worked hard to prepare people for leadership positions who might not otherwise have gone to college;

3. By having its faculty, staff and administrators serve in leadership positions in Baltimore and on the national scene.

Morgan State has achieved its principal success by evolving into a quality black institution that serves black people and gives them something to take pride in. It more than holds its own in the rough and

and tumble of competition among institutions of higher education. Only a handful of other black institutions can make the same claim.

## Morgan State as A Proud, Black Institution

One of the most controversial subjects at Morgan State is whether or not it should continue to be predominantly black. President Martin Jenkins wanted the College to become a truly integrated urban university serving all of Baltimore. The university that Martin Jenkins envisioned would have had its curriculum emphasize urban problems in general and the needs of Baltimore in particular. Whether the idea could have worked will never be known, because the Maryland Council for Higher Education turned the idea down. Some of the black students were upset about the proposed integrated college and wanted Morgan State to remain a predominantly black experience, although the Student Government and a majority of students did approve the idea. President Jenkins still believes in the plan and is hopeful that it will someday be given a chance.,

Morgan State is predominantly black, not by choice but because relatively few whites choose to enroll there as undergraduates. In its Report on Integration Activities, in July of 1969, to comply with provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, its efforts at integration are clearly documented:

> In its recruitment efforts, the Office of Admissions at Morgan State College has always sought to further the integration of the college. In no way is stimulation of interest aimed exclusively at Negro students. All advertising material---pamphlets, brochures, etc.--- stresses our open-door policy. Every emphasis is laid on our integrated campus and student body, and whenever pictures of campus life are a part of recruitment material, shots of the white members of our community are always included.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The most segregated aspect of the institution is the undergraduate student body which, as of the fall of 1968, had less than a hundred whites out of approximately 3500 students. The graduate school is much more integrated, with approximately half of the 500 students being white. On the faculty, there is one white for every three blacks. In intercollegiate athletics, Morgan State competes with predominantly white and predominantly black institutions. The College has also engaged in cooperative endeavors with white institutions including Penn and Johns Hopkins.

The buildings on its 90 acre campus are traditional and solid. There is a scattering of new buildings with modern architecture, including the administration building, and more are planned. Morgan State prides itself on leadership and excellence. The Urban Studies Institute, founded in the fall of 1963, is probably the first such institute in the country located at an undergraduate college. Its Project Mission, a precursor of the Teacher Corps in preparing urban teachers, was one of the first in the country, as was its special education program for students who wouldn't normally have been admissable to Morgan State. A variety of conferences of national and regional scope have been held at the College, including a centennial conference on urban affairs in 1967. The College has an outstanding intercollegiate athletic program and has turned out a number of black professional athletes.

More than in any other way, however, it was the administration of the College under the presidency of Martin Jenkins, which ended in the academic year, 1969-70, that made Morgan State a model institution. Martin Jenkins, whose business-like and serious demeanor makes him seem more like a corporate executive than a college president, worked with state, federal and foundation officials to build Morgan State into an institution of

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

excellence. He was an excellent political administrator, mixing vision, anticipation of trends, friendly persuasion and, when necessary, tough tactics and plain talk, to get things for Morgan State.

There was nothing in Morgan State's early history to indicate its present preeminence. It was founded in 1867 as a biblical institute and there were originally two branches: one in Maryland and the other in Virginia. The name of the college was changed to honor Dr. Lyttleton Morgan, a former chairman of the board of trustees, who made a substantial donation to the college around 1890. The institution was then able to offer courses on the college level and it secured additional grants from the Carnegie Corporation, Rosenwald Fund and from the State of Maryland. Morgan became a state institution in 1939, and since then most of its funding has come from the state and federal governments. The college's rise traces to the inauguration of Martin D. Jenkins as president in 1948. It is his leadership that made the college an important institution and a leader in the area of urban, community, and minority group involvement. President Jenkins always had one simple, straightforward, over-riding goal: to enable this institution to obtain success for its students through education.

Martin Jenkins' leadership is exciting because it is inspirational but not bombastic. He had a few long-range goals and he pursued them doggedly and determinedly over the 22 years of his presidency. He is a relaxed person who is obviously proud of his accomplishments but not boastful. He is comfortable with himself yet impatient with bureaucracy and timidness. He is a pragmatist who forged good relationships with the political leaders upon whose support he depended, yet he never kept his opinions to himself when there were disagreements. He ran the college with a firm hand, being involved in every major decision, but he had an open door policy with the students and had the respect of his faculty. Although modest and realistic in person, he did not hesitate to attempt to inspire his students. His book on Morgan's special education program, An Adventure in Higher Education, ends with goals for both students and teachers:

> Desired Characteristics of Morgan State College Teachers
> It is my desire to bring to Morgan State College teachers who are characterized by high ability and excellent academic preparation; the desire and ability to do a superior job of teaching...I am convinced that any real institution must be concerned with the student as a total person...this contrasts with the view that teachers are concerned only with the fragmental development of students in their particular subject area. Teachers are expected to counsel with students on academic or non-academic matters; to attend occasionally at least the campus affairs given by and for students; and, if possible, to occasionally invite students to their homes. Teachers should in their own behavior and manifested interests reveal to students the characteristics of a liberally educated person...a real interest in the community--teachers are also citizens; teachers at this college should be good citizens. This involves participating in community institutions, contributing to worthwhile civic organizations and participating in the political life of the community...
>
> Goals for the Morgan Student
> I should like every Morgan man and woman to strive for these goals during the undergraduate years; to exhibit intellectual integrity and habits of logical and critical thinking; to read widely with understanding and enjoyment; to convey ideas in clear and concise written and oral expression; to master the techniques of learning; ...to have the self-confidence and determination which are necessary for achievement at high levels; to be a Second Miler--to do more than is expected in any given task; to exemplify in his relations with other people honesty and integrity, a keen sense of responsibility, freedom from racial prejudices and petty social intolerances; to have a sense of personal involvement in arriving at solutions to social problems in a keen desire to accomplish for the common good; to have the courage of his convictions, the desire and willingness to "stand up and be counted" for those things in which he believes.

The nature of the leadership and administration at Morgan State can perhaps best be understood from a look at how reforms in student life and government were brought about. Several years ago, a group of students, including the minority white students on campus, formed an organization called Dissent, that protested the compulsory nature of the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC). The compulsory aspect was quickly changed, although ROTC was maintained. The director of the program feels that it is better off for being voluntary. The students also pressed for a number of reforms including liberalization of rules in the dormitory. These changes were also brought about fairly easily. The leaders of the student government felt that President Jenkins did maintain an open-door policy, did listen to student grievances, and was open to change. They join him in feeling that the problem at Morgan State is that the administration and faculty are ahead of the students and that the students have not become as involved in community affairs or in restructuring the college as they could have been.

At first in our study of Morgan, we felt that the education was too traditional and that the students weren't getting out of the classroom enough into service-learning situations. In large measure this is due to the nature of the students and not the institution. Many of the Morgan students were poorly prepared in high school and academic success doesn't come easily to them. Many students live at home and commute to college and hold jobs that limit the time they can devote to campus and community activities. Many colleges have found that it is hard to offer a different and innovative form of education and at the same time educate poorly prepared students. For whatever reasons, Morgan State's education has been of the more traditional type.

Two events during the last spring of Martin Jenkins' presidency illustrate his forceful style of leadership. In May of 1970, when college campuses throughout the country exploded over United States involvement in Cambodia, the group of educators who made the strongest protest directly to the President were a group of black college presidents representing the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, an organization representing all predominantly black colleges and universities in the nation, of which Martin Jenkins was a key leader. Martin Jenkins wrote the opening of their statement to the President:

> We come to express the anger, outrage, and frustration of the black people of this nation. We wish to convey to you the disenchantment of blacks, especially black youths, with our society and with the federal government...Mr. President, these are strong words which convey to you the feelings of the black people and especially the black students of this nation. These are the bases of unrest and violence. These are the causes of the increasing alienation of black youths. We are convinced that these are the basic problems which demand your immediate attention. We are convinced too that this nation has the strength, the resources, and the moral fibre to solve these problems.

Martin Jenkins stated that the reason for his retirement from Morgan was a cutback in state funds for the College:

> My basic reason (for retiring) is the deterioration of the educational program of the college due to the state's fiscal policy and untolerable controls by an unfriendly budget bureau.

Martin Jenkins was accompanied on his last appearance before the Senate Finance Committee of the State of Maryland in Annapolis by 45 busloads of Morgan State students, faculty and alumni. The students demanded and got a private meeting with the Governor to discuss their grievances. The demonstration, although large, was peaceful and orderly. Martin Jenkins' statement before the Finance Committee tells a great deal about his style of leadership:

> I did not organize this demonstration, but I support it. In my addresses to students over the years, I have encouraged them to participate in politics and to express concern about the state appropriations for the college...

> Let me emphasize the fact that I am an integrationist. I believe that racial distinctions must be eliminated throughout the American society. But this time is not yet here and we do have a basically racist society, one aspect of which is the existence in this state of predominantly white and predominantly black institutions of higher education. And so the black population and our students regard Morgan State as something special in their lives. They know that Morgan State enrolls more black students than all the four-year colleges and universities in the state, public and private, combined. They know of the outstanding program of Morgan State. They are proud of the fact that this program has been developed in a predominantly black college under black leadership.
>
> They now know that as the result of inadequate appropriations, the educational program of Morgan State is deteriorating. The black citizenship and the students of Morgan State, rightly or wrongly, in their general distrust of the white establishment, interpret this as a deliberate state policy to relegate Morgan State to the status of a mediocre institution. And they won't stand for it.
>
> The two most crucial of our nation's domestic problems are race relations and urban deterioration. Our substantial neglect of these problems is tearing our nation to pieces--you can see this before your eyes. In Morgan State College, the state has a great resource contributing to the alleviation of these problems.

Morgan State's basic impact in the area of urban, community and minority group involvement has been as an educator of black people and as an institution in which black people could take pride. Martin Jenkins' particular style of leadership, one which worked with the white establishment in a constructive fashion, but at the same time stood up strongly for its rights, shows that there is a middle ground between timidity and rhetoric.

## The College As An Educator

As colleges and universities have responded to the urban crisis, many have started special programs to admit students who would not otherwise have qualified, such as the Project Teacher Excellence program at Our Lady of the Lake College. Such programs were virtually nonexistent prior to 1967.

Martin Jenkins' book, An Adventure in Higher Education, published in 1964, makes it clear that the special education program at Morgan was not a come-lately add-on, but in fact had evolved over a 15 year period. The goal of the special education program at Morgan State was always very simple:

> ...taking students who have experienced cultural deprivation and preparing them in the short span of the college experience to compete on a basis of equality with other American college graduates. This task requires teachers who believe that it can be accomplished and who have the ability to utilize both conventional and novel procedures to assure its accomplishment.

Morgan's special education program anticipated most of the developments that have since occured in the field. It was built around flexible admissions policies with an attempt to spot motivated, capable students who had not fully realized their potential. Other ingredients were extensive scrutiny of individuals and a good deal of personal guidance. Freshman year was a three-track affair where students who started as disadvantaged were given extensive extra course work. The difference between Morgan's program in special education and for poorly prepared students and those which have been started elsewhere is that at Morgan it is an extensive part of the entire educational program involving a large proportion of the students.

Many of the special educational features that prestigious liberal arts colleges like Oberlin and Swarthmore have instituted are not to be found at Morgan State. At first this was a disappointment to us. However, we came to realize that Morgan places first things first:

> The college need not apologize for having as a primary objective the occupational preparation of students--for a long time to come it must play a major role in producing personnel for high level occupations. Provision must be made, consequently, for extensive major fields of specialization with quantitative and qualitative standards which will enable graduates to meet the performance requirements of a racially integrated economy.

An example of how Morgan's program operates can possibly best be illustrated by examining the experience of several individual students. One student who was quite active in the student government, Roger Brooks, did not reach his senior year at Morgan until he was in his late twenties. He had started at Morgan in his early twenties having exhibited potential and passed the high school equivalency exam to compensate for having dropped out of high school. After two years at Morgan, he got tired of being short of money and took a job as an aide in a mental hospital. Brooks had been active in organizing a union in the hospital and had liked the work, but realized how his lack of a degree limited his potential. By the time he came back to finish at Morgan State, he was really serious about his education and got excellent grades.

There are many parallels between Brooks and Harry Walker, the president of the student government, who is also in his late twenties. Walker had been in the Airborne, but didn't like the military. He started late at Morgan, but also dropped out to take a job. He had worked at a warehouse where he was involved in organizing the workers into a union. He also returned in his late twenties to complete his education at Morgan to get ahead occupationally.

Although Walker personally didn't like the military, he supported the continuation of ROTC at Morgan because he thought it was an important source of preparation of black leadership. Although he had occasional disagreements with President Jenkins, he supported his style of leadership strongly and particularly admired his open door policy. Jenkins and Walker had worked closely together on college budget matters for the state legislature.

## Instruction

Morgan State's black studies program is academic, offering a number of courses in a variety of departments relating to both black culture and Africa. Courses include "The Traditional African Arts," "The Negro in American Prose," and "The Negro and Music." The program was inaugurated with almost no controversy and is considered outstanding. The college does offer a variety of courses on both black people and culture, and urban affairs, but they are located within individual departments and there is no major in either.

## Project Mission

One of the impressive things about Morgan State is that it has often been ahead of its time, as was the case with Project Mission. The program began in 1965, and ran for four years, funded by the Ford Foundation. Morgan State initiated the idea and then enlisted the cooperation of two white colleges, Coppin State and Towson State, to train inner city school teachers. The program placed approximately 150 students as interns in the Baltimore city schools where they spent their entire fourth year of college within the school setting. They received $135 per month, but made a commitment to do two years of teaching in inner city schools after their graduation. The program was regarded as a success and is part of a substantial emphasis on the inner city within the Department of Education.

## The Work Service Community Cooperative

This project was the idea of President Jenkins, who wanted to let students learn how to teach inner city youngsters. The idea gained momentum after a talk at the college in 1967 by Robert Weaver, then the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. As part of a social science course for credit, juniors and seniors were able to work in community projects for credit. A number of host agencies were lined up by James Perry, a young historian who was hired to coordinate the program and who was sold on the idea. A large number of agencies and organizations were selected as hosts and the students were assigned in twos and threes to more than 30 of them. Originally about 50 students signed up for the course in the fall of 1968, but thereafter interest wained and the enrollment diminished sharply. It isn't clear why this happened. It may have been that the program was too time consuming. Despite high level administrative commitment to what could have been an innovative educational program, the idea didn't catch on. There is a certain traditionalism among the students which may be accounted for in part by their initial educational handicaps. Both President Jenkins and student government president Williams feel that the students are not concerned enough about community service.

## Cooperative Education

The program is a five-year program. The student alternates between a company which may well hire him after graduation and the Morgan campus. The companies involved are all major corporations such as the Ford Motor Company, Xerox, and the New York Port Authority outside of Maryland, and Bethlehem Steel Corporation, the Sun Papers, and various city agencies in the area surrounding the campus. This is an excellent means of assuring that Morgan State's graduates will fit in the national economic mainstream.

## The Urban Studies Institute

The Urban Studies Institute, founded in 1963, was the first such institute at an undergraduate college. It is similar to those at many other institutions of higher education in that it has never quite reached its potential despite a good start and excellent leadership. Perhaps the major accomplishment of the Urban Studies Institute is its role in facilitating the start of a much broader Center for Urban Affairs, which Morgan is beginning in the academic year, 1970-71, with help from the State of Maryland and the Ford Foundation. Homer Favor, an economist, has headed the Institute from the start. To an extent, the mission and scope of the Institute was limited at the beginning, because when the state originally promised $35,000 per year to fund it, it wanted to make sure that there would be extensive faculty involvement and that the Institute would be involved in the educational process rather than functioning simply as a semi-autonomous research center. As of the academic year 1969-70, there were only two professionals on the Institute staff, which concentrated on four areas: research, extension, curriculum, and finally, the two staff members serving as urban resources and catalysts for the rest of the college.

The majority of the contract research undertaken by the Urban Studies Institute was done fairly early in its history. Among the research projects was a study of Baltimore inner city unemployment, an evaluation of a teenage mothers program, a cooperative evaluation (with the University of Pennsylvania) of Baltimore's OEO program, and a longitudinal study of an isolated black community. The Institute also published a Maryland statistical abstract giving useful information for local governments, and the Baltimore Metropolitan Area Urban Affairs Bibliography. Several of the programs were action programs such as the Eastern Shore Retraining Project, which attempted to upgrade low skilled workers.

The extension activities of the Urban Studies Institute mainly centered around conferences of regional and national scope, one or more of which has usually been held each year. The subjects have included: "Higher Education and the Challenge of the Urban Crisis," "The Changing Face of Employment Security," and "Justice, Law and Order." These have generally been well attended with outstanding speakers.

Both the director and the associate director, Parren Mitchell, teach urban related courses on campus, and serve as urban technicians for the rest of the College. Perhaps the major contribution that the director and associate director have made, however, is their own personal involvement in the urban scene, both in the Baltimore region and on the national level. Parren Mitchell, the Institute's associate director, has been quite active in political affairs and has just been elected to the U.S. House of Representatives.

There are other urban and community service thrusts at the College which will be resources for the new Center for Urban Affairs. The Institute for Political Education was founded in 1959 with support from the Ford Foundation. The principle goal of the Institute for Political Education was to expose Morgan State students to the functioning of the political system. Ford supported the program for eight years and it then became dormant. The principal thrust of the Institute was political internships where Morgan students worked in the offices of elected officials. These internships were considered quite successful, with the principal complaint being that they were too limited in number. The Institute also ran a number of action projects, including community workshops for urban dwellers and mock political conventions for students on campus. The Institute became controversial when it rented a mobile voting unit which toured black communities explaining voting procedures and urging residents to register.

The Baltimore Business Institute has operated for ten years, convening a conference each spring of six weeks duration for inner city businessmen.

## The Proposed Center for Urban Affairs

The impetus for the new center, named for Martin Jenkins, was an angry but constructive letter he wrote to the Ford Foundation in June, 1969, from which we will quote the highlights:

I sit here with a feeling of frustration and fury occasioned by the Foundation's recent substantial grants to several universities for urban studies. Last year when Morgan State College approached Foundation officials about the feasibility of a proposal to develop an urban program, we received no encouragement whatsoever. This kind of proposal was "not presently being supported by the Foundation." The recent grants to the Johns Hopkins University and other universities follow a ten million dollar grant made to three American universities for urban studies. To my knowledge, no such grants have been made to predominantly Negro institutions.

I am sure that the response of the Foundation will be that in this area it supports only established universities. There is, though, Mr. Bundy, another hypothesis which I wish quite frankly to share with you. The problems of our cities are occasioned primarily by the immigration of Negros. Logically it would appear that Negros must have a key role in effecting solutions to urban problems...The Foundation, though, refuses to recognize the role of a predominantly Negro college. It, in effect, says that we must provide for the preparation of urban personnel under white auspices. As a result, the leaders and prime movers of the future will be almost exclusively white, and the solutions of urban problems will be devised and proposed by whites.

The hypothesis is that the Foundation deliberately intends to discourage the preparation of Negros for top-level professional leadership on the urban scene. The Baltimore situation provides an excellent example. Morgan State has had a small urban studies institute for the past six years, supported by the state on an annual budget of approximately $35,000. Obviously, we can only scratch the surface with this limited budget.

The Johns Hopkins is now in a position, with your support, to provide an extensive program in urban studies and to attract top-level personnel. In the years ahead, it will be the Johns Hopkins which will propose solutions to urban problems and which will prepare the urban specialist in this area. Then the question will be asked, "Why don't those Negros at Morgan State have any ideas or prepare any personnel?"...

The Foundation in recent years has made substantial grants to predominantly Negro colleges for programs to improve specific weaknesses and to bring some of these institutions into the mainstream of institutions of higher education. There has been no indication, however, of massive support in areas where selected, predominantly Negro colleges and

> universities may develop programs as effective as any in the nation. I am convinced that with ample financial support, several predominantly Negro colleges could, with racially integrated staff and students, develop really significant programs. Demonstration that some of these institutions can be in the very front ranks of American colleges and universities in the area of urban problems will be a creative contribution to our culture.

Martin Jenkins did not prepare a formal proposal for the Ford Foundation until he was sure that the state was commited to the program and that it would provide a substantial proportion of the funding. Jenkins requested $600,000 from the Ford Foundation distributed over a four-year period, with grants from the state running from $200,000 at the beginning to approximately $600,000 by 1975.

The Center for Urban Affairs will be involved in both curriculum and service. It will be a direct outgrowth of most of the urban related activities at Morgan State over the years. The curriculum in urban affairs will be greatly strengthened. The one new unit to be established will be a Center for the Study of the Behavior of Urban Youth. The other facets of the new center will be a cooperative education centers program (a direct outgrowth of Project Mission), an ownership training institute growing out of the Baltimore Business Institute, and an urban research institute, which will be a direct expansion of the Urban Studies Institute. The new money from the state and Ford Foundation will enable Morgan to expand and consolidate efforts that have been going on for the past ten years, and to move from a level of honest but inadequate effort to excellence on the national scene.

## Morgan State As A Citizen and Neighbor

Morgan's location in a predominantly white residential section of northeast Baltimore has kept it from being more heavily involved in the problems of its immediate neighborhood. The College has had some impact on the practices and attitubs of its predominantly white neighbors. Morgan students forced the integration of restaurants and theaters at a local shopping center. Many students also rent rooms in predominantly white households in the neighborhood; Morgan plans to expand in the near future and this may occasion some problems. The college shows its neighborly spirit by openings its campus to Baltimore whites and blacks in large numbers. A recreation program in the summer lets inner-city black students use the athletic facilities on campus under the direction of the college's coaches. The Baltimore Symphony Orchestra performs in the Morgan auditorium to predominantly white audiences.

## Summary

Morgan State was included in this selection of college and university involvement in urban, community and minority group affairs because it is deeply involved in the urban scene and because it is a predominantly black institution. Its method of involvement is substantially different from that of the white institutions that we have described. Morgan's principle contributions have been as an educator of black student leadership, and as an institution supporting a predominantly black experience in which black people can take pride. Although that tends to sound somewhat patronizing, this makes Morgan State College an exception rather than the rule for public institutions.

Morgan State is an excellent college that happens to be predominantly black. Its success was in large measure the result of a forceful, but constructive and pragmatic course steered by Martin Jenkins, its president until the fall of 1970. Jenkins, his trustees, faculty, staff and students demanded their fair share of support from public and private funding sources and documented the fact that they used such funding wisely and imaginatively. Morgan's strategies offer an example to all state supported institutions , which too often fail to demand their fair share of support or to obtain the leadership to use it wisely.

In describing Morgan State's position in American society today, Martin Jenkins concludes:

> In view of the temper of the times, I suspect that it is asking too much of white liberals and black activists to regard colleges attended largely by black students as American institutions of higher education rather than black institutions of higher education. I like to think that Morgan State College makes a significant contribution to the total society and that the proportion of whites in the graduate program and the faculty has a great deal of significance.

---

## Morgan State College Selected References

### Publications

Jenkins, Martin D.: An Adventure in Higher Education, Morgan State College Press, 1964.

Baltimore City Public Schools: Project Mission: A Cooperative Teacher Training Program for Preparing Teachers for Assignments in Inner City Schools, 1965.

American Council on Education Newsletter, Higher Education and National Affairs Report, "Presidents of Black Colleges Tell Nixon of Anger, Frustration," May 22, 1970.

### Morgan State Reports

Recommendation to the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges that Morgan State College be Developed as a Racially Integrated Urban Oriented University, January 14, 1969.

Report on Integration Activities, July 7, 1969.

Statement of President Jenkins to the State Senate Finance Committee, February, 1970.

The Proposal for the Center for Urban Affairs, February, 1970.

# CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK:
# OPENING THE DOORS

Robert Price

## CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK - OPENING THE DOORS

On June 7, 1847, the citizens of New York City, by vote of 19,305 to 3,409, established the nation's first tax-supported, tuition-free institution of higher education, the Free Academy. On July 9, 1969, the Board of Higher Education of the City University of New York (CUNY) became the first governing body of any urban university to open its doors to all graduates of its city's high schools. The development during the five years preceding the CUNY open admissions decision provides an interesting story of a university caught up in the swirl of events leaping headlong into a controversial educational venture.

### CUNY on the Eve of Opening the Doors

The CUNY of 1964 was comprised of four four-year colleges and five two-year community colleges. The prestige institution of the system was the City College of New York (CCNY), the successor of the Free Academy. Changing its name to CCNY in 1866, the college had moved to its current site on St. Nicholas Heights in 1907. From the outset, CCNY served primarily the aristocracy of New York. Jenks and Reisman[2] estimate that the average IQ at CCNY in the 1920's and 30's was about the same as at Harvard. As of 1962 CCNY was still ranked among the nation's 100 most selective colleges and in 1965 CCNY headed the list of colleges producing embryonic Ph.D.'s. Despite its location in the middle of Harlem, CCNY was still a middle-class institution that attracted students from all over the city because of its academic standing. In 1965, an 85.5 high school average was required for admission, sixty percent of the seniors went on to graduate study.

Despite its character as a largely Jewish institution in the midst of a black and Puerto Rican community (1965: 75% Jewish, 10% black and Puerto Rican) CCNY experienced much better relationships with its community than its neighbor to the South, Columbia. Partly this was attributable to a series of fortunate developments allowing physical expansion without disruption of the community. But CCNY has also been an institution involved in the city. Every graduate of CCNY has taken at commencement the Ephebic Oath of Devotion to the City of New York, vowing to "strive to transmit this city not only not less but greater, better, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us." In 1913 CCNY established the first educational clinic for emotionally disturbed children. It had the first degree-granting evening session in the city, set up in 1909. In 1954 the School of General Studies instituted a special baccalaureate program for adults. The Bernard M. Baruch School of Business, located on the old Free Academy site, at 23rd and Lexington Avenue, trained many of the city's business leaders.

Despite efforts in the State Legislature in 1869 and 1878 to abolish the municipal college, the system not only survived but expanded. In 1870 Hunter College was established as the Female Normal and High School. It offered its first college instruction in 1888 at its Park Avenue and 68th Street campus. Hunter went co-ed in 1964. (CCNY's College of Liberal Arts and Sciences had first admitted women in 1951) Hunter also had a Bronx campus. The two other four-year colleges were Brooklyn College, opened in 1930, and Queens College in 1937. Both institutions became rather elite colleges, although not considered in the same class with CCNY. Both were predominantly Jewish. In fact, the percentage of non-whites at Brooklyn (about 3%) actually declined from 1953 to 1963. Brooklyn and Queens were among the nation's pioneers in establishing special degree programs for adults who did not meet criteria for regular baccalaureate programs.

In recent years CUNY has undergrown rapid growth which makes it an educational giant. The oldest of the community colleges in the CUNY system is New York City Community College (NYCCC) in Brooklyn. In operation since 1946, NYCCC became a part of the CUNY system in 1964. The first community college founded in the system was Staten Island Community College (SICC) in 1955. In 1957 Bronx Community College (BCC) was opened, and Queensborough Community College began operation in 1960. Two other units were opened in 1963: the Borough of Manhattan Community College (BMCC) at 51st Street and Sixth Avenue and Kingsborough Community College, with two campuses, one in mid-Brooklyn, the other at Manhattan Beach. In 1965 Richmond College was opened on Staten Island as a unique "upper-level" institution, offering junior and senior years to transfer students from the community colleges.

In 1961 the CUNY system was first authorized to award doctorates, 32 of which were granted from 1962-67. A special institution, the Graduate Center was established for graduate students. CCNY and Hunter also offered graduate work, with the latter's urban planning program being among the most innovative. A specialized branch of the system, the John Jay College of Criminal Justice was opened in 1964 primarily for policemen.

In August of 1966 the rapidly expanding CUNY found itself in the most severe budget crisis of its history. The system seemed faced with two alternatives: 1) the imposing of tuition: Regular day session undergraduates paid no tuition, graduate students a fee of $18 a semester. However, tuition-free education was an issue of principle in the system and was fought for bitterly by many alumni; 2) the drastic curtailment of enrollment: As of September 1966, one of every 55 New Yorkers (147,000) would be a CUNY student, 57,000 full-time day undergraduates, 23,000 graduate students, 56,000 evening students. The chancellor and several college presidents offered their resignations. The state legislature averted disaster by coming up with a financial package to save the system. The New York State Legislature is usually dominated by Republicans. However, Democratics were in control in the wake of the Goldwater debacle. The Democrats needed the support of black and Puerto Rican legislators from Manhattan to pass the bill. Instead of falling into Party line, the blacks and Puerto Ricans decided not to support the package because CUNY was not serving their constituents. In exchange for their votes, they managed to get tacked onto the bill $1 million for a special program for the disadvantaged, the Search for Education, Enlightenment, and Knowledge (SEEK) program. SEEK has been the largest and most controversial of the special programs which CUNY has devised. Its development and the controversy surrounding it are of utmost importance in understanding the evolution of CUNY's open admissions plan.

The SEEK program was to begin in September 1966, so university leaders, caught by surprise, had one month to develop a program. It was decided that there would be a good deal of local autonomy to allow each college to develop its own program. There were 1,400 students total in the four four-year colleges under the auspices of SEEK. Hunter began with a part-time evening operation. At CCNY and Brooklyn some groundwork had been laid by similar programs for adults. Queens started from scratch.

CCNY's Pre-Baccalaureate Program

At CCNY there was enough of a foundation in the School of General Studies (GS) to build a carefully thought-out program. GS has as its main functions the providing of opportunities for those who do not meet traditional standards and the providing of evening education for fully matriculated students. For example, the school has served foreign students who were not admitted to CUNY because they did not have an American high school diploma and College Board scores. These students are admitted to GS and may transfer to the day school if they complete 14 credits with a B+, 30 credits with a B, or 60 credits with a C.

While GS had the largest percentage of black and Puerto Rican students of any CUNY unit (24%), it still was not effectively servicing these communities. A high percentage of GS students dropped out. CCNY took two approaches to this problem: First, an intensive counseling program was begun. The night student, because he comes to campus only for classes and then leaves, is unable to put down roots on the campus. A mandatory counseling program was instituted to deal with the student's resulting alienation. Each entering student had to participate for 15 weeks. The program consisted of group meetings plus at least one session per week with a counselor and follow-up sessions during the second term. This was the minimum; more counseling was available if desired. The second focus at CCNY was academic. It became obvious that some change in the curriculum was necessary in the early going to help the slower students and the ones who had been away from college for some time. The key was altering classroom pace. In a math course, for example, extra class hours would be added for those having difficulty. In 1965 this total program known as the Pre-Baccalaureate Program, involved 110 students. When Leslie Berger, a clinical psychologist, became assistant director, the counseling aspect became even more central. "Pre-Bac" became a reservoir of experience upon which SEEK could draw.

Brooklyn College's Academic Talent Search Program

In the fall of 1964 Brooklyn College's School of General Studies began an Academic Talent Search Program (ATSP), with the help of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. Forty-two students, all with academic diplomas from poverty-area high schools in Brooklyn, but with averages below 75 (87 was Brooklyn's cutoff) and all "economically, culturally, and socially disadvantaged" were selected. The students, including 23 blacks and 8 Puerto Ricans, were given remedial work in separate classes limited to their progam while also being enrolled in regular classes. The decision to separate them from other students was made to provide more extensive instruction and to allow the staff to get closer to the students. Four English teachers were employed to work with ATSP students with great freedom to develop new teaching approaches. The students were not penalized for failure. After two semesters, 23 of the original 42 had gained one year of credit and another 12 one semester of credit. In math slower progress was made. The teachers had to do more individual tutoring. All the counselors were members of the Brooklyn College faculty.

Despite the fact that the ATSP students had an average IQ (109.9) almost equivalent to that of regular students (112.4), ATSP was not very successful. After one year retention was high (31, or 74%, with 6 more drafted), but in the second two years 11 more dropped out. In the first year the average gradepoint was 1.8; the second year it dropped to 1.2

and only 25% maintained better than a C. Over the four years only four of the students maintained better than a C- and none graduated. At the end of the summer session of 1968 the ATSP prize pupil did graduate, a girl who maintained a 3.0 average with a Russian major. Thus 10% (4) of the original group met the goals of ATSP, which were matriculation and reasonable progress to a degree.

In evaluating the lack of success of ATSP, several criticisms were offered: 1) the tremendous financial burdens of the students had been underestimated; 2) the effect of environment had been underestimated. Twenty-six of the 42 students were from broken homes; all of the dropouts came from these 26; 3) the counseling setup had not been very successful; 4) the screening process had been done by middle-class personnel, who had chosen students with little self-confidence, drive, or ability to intellectualize. It had, in effect, screened in those most likely to fail. Nonetheless, ATSP became a foundation for SEEK to build on at Brooklyn. When SEEK began in 1966 it took over with significant change the structure and personnel of ATSP, moving it from the school of General Studies to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

## Berger Versus Mulholland

When the SEEK program appeared on the scene in the fall of 1966, Leslie Berger was named its director. His position was one of great responsibility but little leverage. SEEK was decentralized with the major authority in the hands of the presidents of the colleges. The two largest programs were targeted for CCNY and Queens. Berger was given the authority to create an independent SEEK program, unrelated to any branch of the university. This program, based in the Alamac Hotel in Manhattan, was to serve as a model for the other programs. But Berger had no power to force his point of view onto the program at other locations.

The program at Queens College was the one which exploded. Joseph Mulholland was appointed to the $17,000 a year post of director. One could hardly imagine a greater contrast than that between the reserved, Jewish, academic psychologist Berger and the aggressive, outspoken, Irish Catholic, ex-probation officer Mulholland. They held different opinions about almost every aspect of the SEEK program, and an outline of their debate serves as a summary of the issues which should be wrestled with by any institution contemplating a special program for the disadvantaged.

One of the crucial areas of difference was over the nature of the faculty. Berger believed that the faculty of SEEK must be integrated into the regular college faculty. An English professor in a SEEK class is a professor of English, not a SEEK professor. Thus the faculty members must have traditional academic credentials. Without a faculty with tenure which is integrated into the college faculty, SEEK would be the first program slashed in a budget cut. A program with established academic stature could not be so easily removed.

Mulholland, to the contrary, thought SEEK should have a separate faculty, chosen on grounds other than traditional academic credentials. He opposed the idea of first selecting men with credentials and then finding which of them could relate to the students. He wanted younger, teaching oriented instructors whose values had not been changed by getting the Ph. D. First and foremost he wanted teachers who were open and could relate to minority group students. Mulholland felt that Berger and others in the CUNY could not understand this issue because they had had little experience with blacks and Puerto Ricans. He felt that immersion in the academic process had isolated them.

Berger, in response, charged that Mulholland's real concern was with having a faculty that he could control. He felt it would be easier to hire them and fire them if they didn't have academic credentials. Vice-Chancellor for Urban Affairs, Julius Edelstein believes that Mulholland's lack of academic credentials made it very difficult for him to attract good faculty.

The issue of faculty separation leads into that of program separation. Berger believed that SEEK students should be fully integrated into the regular college program as soon as possible. At least 85% of the student's time was to be in regular classes. Careful evaluation of his performance there was to be the criterion of success for SEEK. "We could test x, y, or z," Berger said, "but the real measure is classroom performance." Mulholland disagreed, feeling that it was "preposterous" to put ghetto kids immediately into the Queens educational experience. He felt the gap between their high school experiences couldn't be crossed in one leap. He felt that the SEEK students needed to be immersed in a structured, sheltered environment where they would learn how the system operated and would obtain certain skills.

At Queens in their first semester, SEEK students took all of their courses with other SEEK students. In the second term they were gradually moved into regular courses. Julius Edelstein felt that the pace at Queens was just too slow:

> The actual educational production at Queens was tragically low. Kids were just not moving along. Many became discouraged and dropped out. It is clear that rapid integration of the students into the regular college course is essential.

When students are placed into the highly competitive college situation, counseling becomes vitally important. On this issue Berger seemed to be the "separatist":

> You must accept that SEEK students are different from other students and must help the student to understand in what ways he is different. The difference does not mean good or bad; the difference is preparation and skills. If you delude the student into thinking that he's like the others, you end up not talking about his poverty background or his need for financial aid, aspects of his life which are most relevant to his academic success.

Berger felt that counselors employing psychoanalytic techniques with comprehensive responsibility for the students were the key to SEEK. Mulholland asserted that traditional counseling of this type had been an "abject failure" with black kids. He wanted to hire people from the community, such as coaches or others who might have had no college training at all, to serve as counselors. Berger was able to get control of this aspect of the Queens program, so that all employment of counselors would be done by the central SEEK office. Thus for a time at Queens, there was a SEEK director (Mulholland) and a SEEK counseling director (a Berger appointee). This was an obvious source of strain.

Another controversial area was the criteria for selection and evaluation of student progress. Leslie Berger believed that the high school average is not a predictor of college performance:

> There seems to be some correlation in that those who have done well in high school will do well in college, especially if there is not major environment change. But one cannot say the reverse, especially if there is a drastic change of environment.

Berger's position has been challenged by his former CCNY colleague, Dean Bernard Sohmer. Sohmer agrees that the average of some one who was in high school ten years ago and since has gone through the army or some other maturing experience is no indicator of college potential. But for a person right out of high school it may well be an indicator.

The philosophy of SEEK was to set very low admission standards and to admit students on a random selection basis. Five criteria were established: 1) that a student must live in a designated poverty area; 2) have a high school diploma; 3) be under 30 years of age with preference given to 1964-67 graduates; 4) be willing to enroll full-time and 5) be ineligible for admission under existing criteria. Nonetheless, CCNY and Queens had very different SEEK populations. Fifty percent of the Queens SEEK students had less than a 70% average in high school, compared with 5% at CCNY. When it came to evaluation of the relative successes of the two major SEEK components, Mulholland claims that he had a poorer group to work with; Berger rejects this argument. Berger bases his evaluation on how quickly a student was merged into the regular college course of study; this was not a prime goal in the Queens program. At CCNY in the 1967 class of SEEK students, 53% maintained a C average or better, 30% a B or better. The dropout rate at Queens was much higher than at CCNY--33% versus 8%. The CCNY retention rate for SEEK was 89.8% for one term, 80.2% for two terms, 70% for three terms, 50.4% for four terms, 51.3% for five terms. Mulholland attributes the high dropout rate to his initial feeling that one year would be an indicator of the students' chances for graduation. Thus 25% of the first 100 students were dropped by the program at the end of one year. He later came to feel that he had made a mistake.

## Queens Explodes

According to Mulholland, SEEK at Queens seemed to be functioning well prior to the December 16-23, 1968 explosion. Queens was probably the campus where such a special program stood least chance of succeeding.

The college student body was 90% white, mostly Jewish. The SEEK students were 80% black, 15% Puerto Rican. The college students were largely Queens natives; the SEEK students were predominantly from Brooklyn and Manhattan. The SEEK advisory committee, which investigated the crisis;[11] outlined seven ways in which Queens SEEK was unique and singular compared to others in the system:

1. The headquarters and administrative offices of the program were off-campus, housed in converted living quarters.
2. A much greater percentage of the instructional faculty was special SEEK faculty unrelated to the regular Queens College faculty.
3. There was more physical as well as social and academic separation between the SEEK program and the regular college program.
4. Currents and tides of unrest and dissatisfaction had been more evident in the SEEK program at Queens than elsewhere, over a longer period of time.
5. At Queens there apparently had been a somewhat greater tendency and willingness to experiment in curricular matters, and to involve both students and faculty in decision-making, including the hiring of faculty.
6. A large number of each entering class was recruited by the Queens SEEK staff rather than through the Central Admissions Office to which most applicants were referred by community groups.
7. Students were permitted to receive stipends and at the same time to earn maximum financial subsistence through tutoring. In addition, the Committee reported, there was a teeming world of rumors, reports, and gossip, providing "almost the total environment for the SEEK community."[11]

Mulholland would agree with all but the fourth of these points. The Committee also gave the program quite a high rating, calling it "not only basically worthwhile but rather wonderful." Some internal changes had been made in the conservative college. For example, the English Department had been convinced to give credit in a course in which the school bought cameras for students to do a photo study of their community. In a history course students were given access to maps and records in the Municipal Building to do a history of their block. The program was ballooning. There had been evidence of success, but also a warning of impending trouble. The program grew from 100 students in 1966 to 400 in 1967 to 700 in 1968, with a projection of 1,000 in 1969. Mulholland expressed openly that the program should have a black director. (Berger calls this both dishonest and paternalistic.) Efforts were also being made to add black faculty. Only three of twenty were black in 1965; ten new blacks were added in September 1968. Mulholland admitted to difficulty in relating to these new blacks, some of whom were very militant. In October 1968 the students elected a twenty-man committee, which suggested to Mulholland that he hire two black assistant directors and at the end of the year they would decide if either of them should replace him as director.

From that point on matters went rapidly downhill, and the exact picture of what went on has never been put together. The spark was apparently a Board of Higher Education resolution of October 28 which authorized (not required) each senior college to establish a separate Department for SEEK faculty, counselors and remedial instructors to put faculty tenure within the reach of the special SEEK faculty. The resolution further suggested that SEEK instructors in regular academic subjects be related to and appointed from the appropriate academic departments, so they, too, could aspire to tenure.

On December 12 Mulholland called a meeting of the Queens SEEK faculty to tell them that he was opposed to this second part of the resolution to "merge SEEK into the regular Queens curriculum." After a week of escalating rhetoric, 150 students attended a meeting called by the Black and Puerto Rican Student-Faculty Coalition. Nine demands emerged from this emotion-charged, whites-excluded meeting which ended with a blood oath of secrecy administered by an African warrior. The demands were: 1) SEEK be opened to "brothers and sisters off the street"; 2) SEEK students be allowed to take a full course load of SEEK courses with twelve hours credit; 3) more black and Puerto Rican teachers be hired; 4) academic counselors replace "psychiatric counselors"; 5) all tutors be SEEK students, who will receive full tutor's salary regardless of stipend; 6) all academic placement tests be devised by black and Puerto Rican teachers and counselors; 7) courses be relevant to the black and Puerto Rican experience; 8) more student participation be authorized at all levels; 9) seminars and honors programs to be instituted.

As is clear from the report of the SEEK Advisory Committee, these nine demands were closer to realization at Queens than in other SEEK programs in the system. Particularly the second, fourth, fifth, and eighth demands were uniquely characteristic of the Queens program. The Coalition demanded response by January 2, so a meeting was set at 11 a.m. that day with Dean Robert Hartle and Mulholland. The Coalition did not show up and announced at an afternoon rally that the administration's refusal to meet with them meant that tactics would be escalated. Immediately, the library was occupied. A new list of demands was issued, the list headed by a call for Mulholland's resignation as a "poor administrator and a poor symbol who had not hired enough black and Puerto Rican teachers and lacked the confidence of SEEK students." The Coalition demanded the power to name his successor. As violence escalated and white vigilante student groups were formed, President Joseph MacMurray ordered the school closed.

The closure further enraged many white students. A student described a typical white reaction to the SEEK disturbance:

> They're ungrateful. They get in here without the marks everyone else has to have, and some of them are even getting paid. It's amazing that they're the ones causing all the trouble.

At one point a dozen members of the Student Coalition, a conservative group, ransacked the office of The Phoenix, the student paper, because it had supported the SEEK student demands. They also accused MacMurray of "constantly groveling at the feet of a small group of radical students, rather than asserting leadership or responsibility."

Mulholland reached the conclusion that he should resign to prevent further violence. Later he changed his mind and decided to submit the issue to secret ballot voting by the SEEK students. Accepting a Coalition invitation to present his position, he felt himself sitting in a kangaroo court. The tribunal by standing vote declared Mulholland guilty, but he was sufficiently encouraged by the support he received that he did not resign. What Coalition intimidation could not produce, an emergency faculty meeting brought about. Mulholland called the meeting a "classic case of the academic mind at work." Much of the time was spent in resolutions, amendments, procedural haggles and abstract debate. A number of faculty members spoke out in favor of Mulholland but expressed the opinion that it would not be proper for the faculty to take a political position. At this point Mulholland shouted his resignation and stormed from the room.

Dean Hartle, a specialist in 17th Century French Literature, decided to take personal control of the SEEK program. Three hours after he assumed the position of interim director, his office was attacked and practically destroyed. Two days later, on February 5, Lloyd Delaney, a black English professor, was named interim director.

Mulholland received no public support from the college or the university. Leslie Berger, in a New York Times interview, blamed the crisis on Mulholland's parole officer approach. In its February 3 official report the SEEK Advisory Committee stated that the major focus in the controversy was Mulholland's competence and leadership. Yet it followed that sentence with the statement that judgment of that question was not essential. Rather it recommended that as of September 1969 the director: 1) be a person academically qualified to be a member of the Queens faculty so he could command respect among his academic peers; 2) be a member of a minority group so that he might serve as a model for SEEK students; and 3) be chosen by a committee including students.

Queens SEEK has run with comparative smoothness since the spring of 1969 crisis. In September 1969, Dr. Ralph Lee, former academic Dean at Morehouse College, was named the new director. In the spring of 1970 there were some demonstrations demanding power for students to hire and fire faculty, but compared with 1969 the scene was peaceful. As a result of the Queens experience, the Board of Higher Education created a special committee responsible only to it -- and therefore structurally higher than the Chancellor -- to deal with special programs for the disadvantaged. The Committee decided that the path followed for a year and a half at Queens was a mistake and that everything possible must be done to integrate SEEK students into the curriculum. Of the Committee Julius Edelstein says:

> What is missing at so many institutions is a voice that has real influence at the policy-making level and real control over the program. We now have a body with that power and leverage.

## SEEK at Other Colleges

Queens College was far from the only CUNY unit experiencing student disruptions in the spring of 1969. In fact, at one point in early May, Queens, Brooklyn, and CCNY were all closed due to demonstrations related to SEEK. Only Hunter, of the major Institutions, was open so a discussion of its SEEK program would seem to be in order. That discussion is made easier by a study of the program done by the Bureau of Social Science Research in Washington in December 1969.[14]

The Hunter SEEK program began as a part-time evening operation in the fall of 1966 and became full-time two years later. As of 1969 it involved 346 students, all but ten full-time. A full-time director was named in July 1968. When the program went full-time, guidelines for staff were set up with a minimum educational requirement for remedial instructors of an M.S.W. and a Ph.D. in psychology required for counselors. The program was set up basically as a five-year baccalaureate; SEEK students were the same as regular Hunter students except that they could make use of the special SEEK services if they desired to, with only counseling being mandatory if the student wished to receive a stipend. There were four special SEEK services: 1) Weekly stipends up to $50 administered by the counselor; 2) Remedial courses in reading, English, high school math and foreign languages and special sections of regular courses in English, history, math, sociology, speech, Spanish, French, biology, psychology and anatomy and physiology. These sections were taught by specially chosen Hunter faculty. The courses were taught at the same level as regular sections but classes were smaller and sessions were more lengthy; 3) Counseling, with one counselor per fifty students; 4) Tutoring, with one tutor per three to seven tutees in workshop sections set up by the instructors.

Hunter's program provides a clear picture of how, on paper, a SEEK program was to function. The BSSR study showed that 50% of the students maintained a 2.00 (C) average or better. Strengths of the program were judged to be its close student-staff relationships, its integration into the regular curriculum, and the staff coordination, facilitated by a monitoring system directed by an academic diagnostician who examined personal records and test scores in order to provide continuous evaluations. This was to be strengthened even more by the move in September 1969 to incorporate SEEK with Hunter's other special programs into a Department of Academic Skills.

The report noted:

> Most of the students and staff that we interviewed agreed that SEEK is, in a very concrete manner, helping to reshape the image of Hunter with respect to its educational mission, improving racial relations and dissipating stereotypes, and increasing respect for people of lower socio-economic backgrounds traditionally excluded from the elite institutions of higher education.

The program was, of course, not without weaknesses. Some students still felt they were considered as "separate," particularly by some condescending instructors. The major criticism was the lack of exciting courses, pointing up the "difficulty in providing challenging and interesting courses concomitant with overcoming academic handicaps."

The Hunter experience of success was shared by SEEK programs everywhere. In the February 1967 term, 43% had had a three-term average of C or better; 17.4% of B. The September 1967 class did slightly better: 52.5% C, 19.7% B.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Brooklyn College's Educational Opportunity Program

In 1968 Brooklyn College began the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), the first discretionary admissions program in CUNY. The regular admission standard at Brooklyn was a 75 average and 450 on both math and verbal College Board tests. Under EOP if a student met any one of these three standards he would be admitted. A sit-in demonstration forced Brooklyn to put the plan into operation; President Harold C. Syrett prevailed upon the Board of Higher Education to approve EOP for a two-year experimental trial. One hundred and eighty-three students (112 black, 48 Puerto Rican) were selected for the program, and Dr. Richard Trent was named its director.

The College, unfortunately, provided almost no supportive services for EOP. Only because Trent, a respected scholar, was willing to sacrifice a year to do nothing but run EOP was the program able to have any success. The students were given a five-week summer intensive college preparation course with workshops in reading, writing, and study skills. The students were limited to twelve credits in the first term, all of which could be taken on a pass/fail basis. No other support was provided, and tutoring was done on a volunteer basis. Trent was the only professional staff member. At the outset he did not even have secretarial help or physical space. But in the first semester only five students dropped out. (Two joined the Air Force, and one took a scholarship at another institution, and one took a job to support his family.) The students did so well that the program was amended to permit any EOP student who earned a C+ average the first semester to take a full credit load the second. The next year 200 more students were added, and Trent was given an office and two secretaries.

Trent, not unexpectedly, is bitter at the College. He says:

> They don't really care about these kids. They have talked up a good program but they haven't supported it. If they were really concerned, they could get the money to give these kids help. The ones who have succeeded have done so despite the College, not because of it.

SEEK at Brooklyn faired somewhat better as in 1968-69, 22 full and part-time instructors were employed for SEEK, a director was hired, and a counselor was employed for each 45 students.

Another special program at Brooklyn in 1968-69 involved 37 students from the One Hundred Scholars Program. This is a program which promises CUNY admission to the top 100 students in each of the sixty public academic high schools in the city, regardless of the student's average or the kind of diploma he earned. Of these 6,000 students, about 800 would not normally be admitted. The same offer was extended to non-public academic high schools of 500 or more graduates, and 20% of the graduating class of smaller schools were offered admission.

## The Hotel Alamac SEEK Program

The experimental SEEK program begun under Leslie Berger's direction at the Hotel Alamac in 1967 has been one of the more interesting and successful units of the SEEK program. The program occupies seven floors of the Hotel, three providing space for administrative offices and class-room space for 500 students and four providing dormitory space for 200. The program was begun because of a CCNY study of SEEK students in 1967 which showed that 41% of the students lived alone in rooming houses or congested slum quarters. Fifteen percent were in other "highly undesirable housing." The Alamac program was an attempt to measure the importance of a change of environment. As of July 1970 the CUNY could report: "None of the students in the residence has left college for academic reasons."

The students had organized among themselves tutoring programs for disadvantaged children, a "big brother" type of program to provide a positive role model for ghetto children, classes and workshops in creative writing, dancing, Latin jazz music, Afro-American music, photography and theater, a published anthology and a Speakers Forum.

## College Discovery in the Community Colleges

The previously discussed programs operated in the four-year colleges. But an older and even more effective program has been in operation in the community colleges. College Discovery was begun in 1964 as a five-year experiment. It differed from SEEK in reaching students while they are still in high school. Its criteria for admissions are about the same as those of SEEK: 1) age less than 30; 2) possession of a diploma of any kind; 3) New York City residence for one year; 4) no college attendance previously, unless a veteran with a maximum of 18 credits; 5) unqualified for regular admission. In addition an income maximum for the family is set. Partial funding is provided by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Prong I of Discovery began in the fall of 1964 with a group of students who were provided with a summer of remedial work and testing and were enrolled in the transfer program of community colleges. In the fall of 1967 this arm of the program admitted 766 students to college, 750 others entered in each of the next two years. In June 1968 five students who entered the first Discovery class were given bachelor's degrees, one of them "cum laude."

Prong II of Discovery was begun in 1965. Students are identified in the ninth grade on the basis of high potential but poor grades and little prospect of college entrance. These students are provided with three years of intensive work at one of five development centers, one in each borough. Upon graduation they are guaranteed admission to the CUNY under the College Discovery umbrella, if they do not qualify under regular criteria.

As of the fall of 1967 there were 1,184 students in this program. A 1967 study of 579 tenth graders in the program showed that of the 97% who stayed in the program all year, 60% passed all their subjects, 4% had above a 90 average, 12% above 85 and 21% over 80. A June 1968 evaluation revealed that 415 of 529 students brought in at the junior high school level earned college admission. As of January 1969 there were 2,289 students in or graduated from Discovery, 1,500 of whom were enrolled in the six community colleges. Only 80 students of 1,100 in the first four years of the development center program dropped out.

There are a number of exciting programs which are conducted under the umbrella of College Discovery. Five high schools whose students had low scholastic achievement were adopted by CUNY. Each high school became part of a college complex, with the college faculty supplementing the regular faculty and college students used as tutors. Another program, based at the Manhattan Urban Center, is conducted in cooperation with the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) and funded by the Department of Labor. One hundred and twenty students who have a minimum of seventh grade reading level were released from NYC work for instruction. They were paid for 30 hours of NYC work but were released for 15 hours of instruction. The special instruction came from the Urban Center College Adapter Program. College Discovery agreed to admit all of those students in this program who reached college equivalency. Twelve were so admitted in September 1969.

Another such program is the Public Service Careers Program conducted at NYCCC and BMCC under an agreement with the City Human Resources Administration and the Department of Social Services. The first step was to bring people up to high school equivalency and employ them at an entry-level job. Then the students were released half-time to go to school to complete their B. A. degree. The students took nine hours of courses and received three hours of credit for their employment in the field work situation. One hundred and eighty students were involved in three kinds of programs: social service aides, teacher aides and nurses aides.

In cooperation with Bronx Community College, with partial funding by the Ford Foundation, the Bilingual College Program was begun in 1968 for Spanish-speaking students who had graduated from high school. In the first semester the students take 15 hours of English as a Second Language and two college courses--Spanish 21 and the History of Western Civilization, both taught in Spanish. The same program is repeated the second semester, and the students get a total of 14 credits. From then on they are gradually integrated into the regular college program, as their language facility permits. A social and cultural program, counseling, and tutoring are provided. Forty-five students (out of 500 applicants) began the program and less than 10% dropped out; 45 more were admitted in the fall of 1969.

One of the most exciting programs in Discovery is Identity 70 (originally Identity 69), a program involving veterans recruited through the Department of Defense's Project Transition. About 6,000 young men per month are released from service at Fort Dix, New Jersey, after returning from Vietnam. The average waiting time between return and release is three to six months, during which the men spend most of their time doing grounds work or KP. Identity 69 was devised with the following goal:

> To seek out enlisted men of the armed forces stationed at Fort Dix Army Installation and McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, while still on active duty, who had poor academic backgrounds and social orientations, who would not otherwise have considered college as a viable alternative and organize a range of activities which would be designed to stimulate interest in academic advancement, eliminate much of the educational disability and motivate these men to actively seek and gain admission to CUNY.12

The selection criteria was four-part: 1) Six months or less duration of service remaining; 2) Age 18-35; 3) New York State residents; 4) Two years of high school or interest in finishing high school education with the guarantee of college admission.

The program was set up through Staten Island Community College. Four days a week soldiers were released three or four hours a day to take special educational programs of the College Adapter type. The men were thus introduced to college-level work while still within a secure environment. The staff consisted of three veterans of the Street Academy program. A guarantee was given to New York City residents that successful completion of the program would lead to CUNY admission. Non-city residents were offered help in gaining admission elsewhere. The first class contained 50 men, about half of them minority and about half married; 43 survived. Following this success, 50 men were put through the program every three months, a total of 200 by July 1970. SICC President Bill Birenbaum said that the graduates perform "on the norm." And, presence of these "older, more studious men had a positive impact on the campus generally." In April 1970 the program was extended to 50 prisoners in the Fort Dix stockade.

Funding had been a problem for this program. It began with $100,000 from CUNY, the State Education Department, and the Esso Education Foundation.

The Department of Defense provided only facilities, no funds. Pentagon officials say this is intentional. "There's a lot of criticism that the military is getting its fingers into everything," says Frank McKernan, director of Project Transition, "and we don't want to appear to be meddling here." It is hoped that G.I. Bill money can be used for this program in the near future.

On the whole, it appears that the programs under College Discovery have been more successful than SEEK in terms of attrition. The attrition rate of Discovery students during the first two years is no worse than the normal community college attrition rate. Former Director Leonard Kreisman feels that the reason may lie in the fact that community colleges are involved rather than four-year colleges in the first two years. Community colleges are more teaching-oriented, so the students probably get more attention even in the non-developmental courses. Further, of the students who complete the first two years, 85% eventually receive the four-year degree; there is little attrition during the last two years. Kreisman believes this is because they enter the four-year school as college juniors and cannot be identified by the professor as a "special student."

Urban Centers

Educational planners in the office of Governor Rockefeller developed the idea of urban-based skill training centers. Some members of the educational establishment resisted the idea of these "pseudo-colleges," but nonetheless four were set up in Brooklyn, Manhattan, Troy, and Buffalo. The State University system provides the funding and has contracted with NYCCC and EMCC to supervise them. The Director of the Urban Center is responsible to the president of the supervising community college and is appointed by him. Each Center has a local community board to advise it. The budget comes directly from the State University to the Center. The programs are designed mainly to train persons to go to work within the space of a couple of months. It was also found that students exposed to the educational experience developed a desire for more education. So a College Adapter track was also instituted.

The Brooklyn Center, headed by George Howard, is located about a mile into the ghetto from New York City Community College in Brooklyn. The success of the Center could be partially attributed to the encouragement offered by NYCCC. That college, begin in 1946 by the State University as one of five post-high school vocational training schools, is one of the few community colleges which has more students in its vocational track than in its liberal arts transfer track. In fact, the transfer track was not instituted until 1965. Erwin L. Harlacker, author of a major study of community colleges, says that NYCCC has "the most extensive in-plant training program in the country." In recent years it has trained 180 newly appointed business inspectors, 300 building inspectors, 320 dietary aides from 18 hospitals, 1,000 nurses aides, and 700 municipal employees. In addition, NYCCC has the largest minority enrollment of any college in the state -- 6,000 black and Puerto Rican students of 13,500 total day and evening enrollment.

Not surprisingly the Brooklyn Center has focussed on skills training. Its strength is its immediacy. One year is the maximum length of stay. Among the programs: Offset Duplicating (12 weeks), Data Processing (3 weeks for a keypunch operator, 6 weeks for a machine operator), Office Skills (6 months to a year), Drafting (1 year), Secretarial Science (6 months to a year) and Business Machine Repair (1 year). One of the more unusual programs is the 10-week Apparel Processing program, where students are trained in a large, well-equipped laboratory.

There is a great emphasis on placement; the Center, in fact, claims 100% job placement. A great deal is done in counseling trainees on the interview experience and the social environment of work, two areas where most problems with minority employables occur. A videotape setup is used to stage and criticize job interview performance, particularly its non-verbal aspects. This technique has improved the success on the first interview from 30 to 50%. No one has been unable to get a job by the sixth interview. Also the retention rate in the program is 70-90%.

The College Adapter program does not function like Discovery and SEEK, which place the student directly into the college course and provide him with supporting services. It rather emphasizes pump-priming and transition, taking the student to the college for only one or two courses. At the Center the student studies four courses for six months to one year: 1) Introduction to College English; 2) Study Skills; 3) Math; 4) Foreign Language. Graduates of the Adapter program can enter New York City Community College. As of March 1969, the College Adapter program had placed 250 students in NYCCC. There were 600 students enrolled in the Center, 10% high school dropouts; 200 were in the Adapter. One of the programs success stories concerns a high school dropout who had a serious language problem. After one year at the Urban Center and one year at NYCCC, where he maintained an A average, he transferred to UCLA to major in electrical engineering.

The Manhattan Urban Center is newer than the one in Brooklyn, opening in January 1969 at the Hotel Theresa in Harlem. Under the leadership of John Work, it has begun to establish its own separate identity. It differs from the Brooklyn Center in having an evening division and in focussing more on the College Adapter program. The latter has been a result partly of lack of space and partly of the demands of students. Borough of Manhattan Community College has committed itself to accepting 50 students per semester from the Manhattan Urban Center. The Manhattan Center has also added a College Adapter Prep program for sixth and seventh graders, and a College Adapter with a focus on nursing to prepare students for BMCC's nursing program.

The future of the Urban Centers in the light of CUNY's move to open enrollment is much in question. Julius Edelstein feels that the Centers will still play an important role for those desiring an unstructured program and a vocational, indeterminate semester training program. The College Adapter was never envisioned as a major track for CUNY admissions, and it will continue to pick up those who discover a desire to attend college and do not have a high school diploma. The Urban Centers will thus retain a role, although not as great a one as envisioned in the Master Plan which projected that in 1975 they would handle 25% of CUNY admissions.

## Open Enrollment

The City University as early as 1964 drafted a plan to offer some kind of post-high school education to every high school graduate by 1975. The projection for that was as follows:

| | Percent of high school graduates | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Type of education | Offered admission | Expected to enroll | Students entering |
| Senior colleges | 25% | 16% | 23,000 |
| Community Colleges: Career & Transfer | 40 | 23 | 37,000 |
| Community Colleges: College Discovery | 10 | 7 | 9,000 |
| Skills Center | 25 | 20 | 23,000 |
| Total | 100% | 66% | 92,000 |

To meet the expanded enrollment, several changes were planned and instituted.[3,4,6] Enrollments in all the four-year colleges were to be gradually increased as the colleges expanded physically. In July 1967 the Bronx campus of Hunter became an independent entity, Lehman College. At the same time the Baruch School of CCNY became Baruch College, an independent college with emphasis on business. York College opened in September 1967 with 400 freshmen; Richmond College began that same month with 900 students. Queensborough and Staten Island Community Colleges opened in 1967 with 6,531 and 3,640 students respectively.

But with normal expansion of these institutions, there would still be a deficit of space for 12,500 students in 1975. The answer to this need was to be the opening of three new community colleges, Seven in Bedford-Stuyvesant,[5] Eight in the Bronx near Lincoln Hospital with emphasis on health curricula,[8] and Nine in Long Island City. This expansion plan was somewhat modified as the representatives of the Bedford-Stuyvesant community rebelled against the community college as a second-class institution. Their negotiating committee stated, "If a college is going to be established in Bedford-Stuyvesant, it must offer baccalaureate degrees and it must be controlled by the community." As a result of negotiations, the new institution was established as a college of professional studies, granting both two and four-year degrees.

The 1975 target date, however, was not quick enough to suit students. Demonstrations in the spring of 1969 forced advancement. The trigger for demonstrations was a threatened curtailment of enrollment or increase of fees because of a budget crisis. CUNY requested a budget increase from $205.6 million to $270 million to handle a projected 20,000 freshman class. The Governor requested a reduction to $225 million, which would have cut the class to between 14,000 and 16,500. Cuts by the City administration threatened to cut the budget still further to $180 million. The Republican leadership in the legislature also attempted to lump all of the SEEK money into a statewide fund from which all colleges could bid, but the bill failed. In March 13,000 students marched on Albany to protest the cuts. The pressure succeeded in cutting the deficit to $17 million.

The momentum generated by student dissatisfaction with budget cutting carried over into a series of violent confrontations in April and May. The Queens situation has been discussed earlier; Hunter had a milder flare-up although the pot did not really boil over there until a year later. Brooklyn College witnessed a major demonstration, with student demands centered around student power, black studies courses, the hiring of more black and Puerto Rican faculty, and open enrollment. It was at CCNY, however, that the major disruption took place.

On April 23, 1969, black and Puerto Rican students occupied the Administration Building and issued five demands: 1) The establishment of a degree-granting school of black and Puerto Rican studies; 2) The setting up of a separate orientation program for black and Puerto Rican students; 3) A greater voice for students in setting guidelines for SEEK, including hiring and firing of personnel; 4) Black and Puerto Rican history and Spanish language a requirement for all education majors; 5) The racial composition in future freshmen classes reflect the black and Puerto Rican population in the city high schools (50% roughly--CCNY freshman class had 24%). Demand number four was granted almost immediately, despite some hesitation that the trend toward fewer required courses should not be reversed. The College was closed through May 5 as negotiations on the other points continued. On May 5 the Board of Higher Education ordered the school reopened, under threat of a court order obtained by Mayoral candidate Mario Proccacino. On May 10 President Buell G. Gallagher resigned because of this development, offering the following poignant analysis:

> I Would have wished that the pace of institutional change had kept ahead of rising expectations born of the success of the civil rights movement, and that there had been a little more patience or compassion mixed with justifiable rising anger of the poor and the black. But institutional inertia did not yield fast enough and the pressures of long-deferred hope left no room for careful and considered action.

Joseph H. Copeland succeeded Gallagher as President and was immediately faced with a strike of black and Puerto Rican faculty protesting reopening.

On May 26 the CCNY Faculty Senate proposed a dual admissions plan under which 50% of the 1970 freshman class would come from the 11 Harlem and Bronx high schools in slum neighborhoods without regard to the students' academic performance. The proposal created an uproar, particularly in the midst of a Mayoralty election. The Jewish Press was most vehement in the protest that this would raise the cutoff for regular admissions much above the current 82 high school average. On June 4 the faculty repudiated the above plan and voted to admit 400 addition freshmen from disadvantaged areas in each of the next two classes. No one who met current standards would be turned away. Committees were set up to study the other student demands.

At this point the Board of Higher Education entered the scene and on July 9, 1970 announced that its open enrollment target date had been accelerated to September 1970. Julius Edelstein says:

> We would have been a very insensitive and unresponsive institution if we had not gone into an intensive re-examination and debate following the CCNY crisis, the Faculty Senate proposals and the reaction to that proposal by every public offical in the State of New York.

> We examined all the alternatives and decided that the only viable one was to do in one year what we had planned to do in five. We were committed to it in principle. We had the example of SEEK as a prototype and thus we knew we could do it, although we are still not sure we can on a vast scale and without parameters.

Any high school graduate with any kind of diploma was guaranteed admission. All students were to take a placement exam in the spring to determine their needs for remedial or tutorial work. SEEK and Discovery were to be expanded to do the remediation. The approach was to be a variety of curriculum possibilities: accelerated or honors programs, remedial and tutorial programs, compensatory education, extension of time for completing a course to more than one semester. In answer to the charge that the system was lowering its standards, the Board had a clear response:

> It has been and still is the philosophy of the University that its standards must clearly be tied to the quality of the degrees it awards and to the quality of the instruction which the institution offers, and not merely to the grade point averages of the students it admits. Current research and testing have revealed that various exclusionary admissions policies may err in predicting a student's success in college, and that the best method of determining how well a student will do in college is to admit him and evaluate his performance there. This concept, implemented by a vigorous program of counseling, remedial and tutorial work, will provide maximum opportunity for success. Academic standards will be maintained and enhanced by CUNY's faculty. College credit will be awarded only upon satisfactory completion of course requirements as established by the faculty.[13]

Or, as Vice-chancellor T. Edward Hollander says:

> Quality is determined not by who you take in but by who you graduate.

CUNY's deliberation over exactly how to implement open admissions caused much controversy. At its October 23 meeting the Board weighed three alternative plans presented by a specially-created committee on admissions: 1) 82.5% of the freshman class would be admitted on the basis of class standing not on average as at present. 17.5% would be admitted under SEEK criteria; 2) 25% would be admitted on the basis of stated college preference; if the number qualified exceeded the places allotted, places would be assigned randomly. Roughly 60% would be admitted on the basis of class rank, and roughly 15% under SEEK criteria, the exact proportions determined on the basis of ethnic balance; 3) the major portion would be admitted on class rank with "sufficient seats" reserved for SEEK and for the achieving of ethnic balance. Under these plans all but about 800 of the 30,000 freshmen would be admitted to the program of their choice but not necessarily to the college of their choice. Protests against a "quota system" were heard on all sides.

The final plan adopted was a marriage of all three alternatives. High school graduates are divided into ten catagories. Students with an 80 or above average or in the upper half of their class would be eligible for the senior college of their first or second choice; the remainder would be eligible for community colleges. SEEK and Discovery would continue to do their own recruiting on the basis of need, both programs expanded. Those not selected to those two programs would be admitted to the University but provided with no stipends. University money was granted for remediation but not for aid. The budget set up was to divide students into three classes: A-regular admittees, B-those with averages of 70-75 who would need some remediation, up to one-fourth of their program the first year remedial, C- those who would need at least half remedial. The funding level was to provide $400 for each B student and $500 for each C student.

Funding the new program also caused problems. The Board requested $60 million. Mayor Lindsay offered $22 million. Chancellor Albert H. Bowker proposed that the difference come from an increase of student fees from $35 to $110 a semester, prompting student outcries. The final budget was $25-30 million. Creating a further strain was the projection that 35,000 students would be freshman, 5,000 more than funded. Despite the problems, many educators praised CUNY's decision. John W. Kneller, the new President of Brooklyn College, said,

> Open admissions is one of the most splendid opportunities that any educational institution has had in the history of this country.

CUNY approaches the fall of 1970 with trepidation. Two issues in particular are of concern. First is the realization that the students, once admitted, must succeed. CUNY Trustees have made it clear that they are aware of the importance of this:

> We do not want to provide the illusion of an open door to higher education which is in reality a revolving door, admitting everyone but leading to a high proportion of student failure after one semester.15

Leonard Kreisman, former Director of College Discovery and now Dean of Administration at SICC puts it more bluntly:

> If we are only developing a form of the Midwestern "wash-out" system, we will have every black and Puerto Rican in the City of New York on our backs. Similarly, we are not going to be able to make sure they succeed by bastardizing the standards. Then the degree and the grades won't be worth a damn.

Kreisman, Julius Edelstein and others think the key to the success is the faculty. Thus the second concern is that the CUNY faculty has not been adequately prepared for the arrival of open admissions. Kreisman says:

> Even if we had unlimited resources, what have they done to take the message to the faculty? Nothing!

Some of this concern is reflected in Chancellor Bowker's suggestion of a program involving a corps of young, highly motivated college grads from throughout the nation to tutor undergraduates while engaging in advanced studies themselves. CUNY on July 28 commissioned the American Council of

Education to do a two-year study with periodic reports on the success of the program.

### Staten Island Community College

The conclusion to this chapter is not a summary of CUNY's program but rather a picture of one institution — Staten Island Community College. This picture emphasizes that no matter what programs are developed, personal commitment is the key to meaningful university response to urban problems. In September 1968 William Birenbaum took over the Presidency of SICC, a rather new, elitist community college in the conservative borough of Richmond. Possessed of new facilities and a faculty originally recruited for a four-year college, SICC had the reputation of being the neatest, smoothest operating branch of the system. Of the 4,000 students, only 32 were black or Puerto Rican, the lowest percentage of minority group students among the community colleges and second lowest of all the units of CUNY. Of the 400 member staff, only 17 were blacks or Puerto Ricans and ten of these were on the groundskeeping staff.

Birenbaum immediately attacked the problem. He helped convince SICC to take its first College Discovery program; all of the other community colleges had already done this. The decision was made one week before classes began, and 60 students were brought in. Eight black faculty members were added, a 400% increase. Three high-level black administrators were hired.

After doing his own study of the borough, Birenbaum determined that about 10% of Richmond was black and Puerto Rican, located mainly in five ghetto areas. For two months he went house-to-house talking to families and distributing brochures. By the end of November he had established connections with 21 black community organizations. He got them to produce a list of 3,000 high school dropouts on Staten Island. He agreed to admit 150 of these in the Special Opportunity Program -- if the black organizations would recruit them, make the decisions on who would get in and commit themselves to counseling the students at least once a week during the year. By January the program was in operation; 110 of the initial 150 survived until June.

The next step was the Identity '69 program for veterans discussed previously. Also SICC was designated by the Human Resources Administration as the basic education center for Richmond to work with 150 students. Eighteen of these were admitted to SICC in the fall of 1969. Also at that time 250 more Discovery students were to be admitted. In one year Bill Birenbaum increased minority enrollment at SICC from less than 1% to about 10%, all on the basis of three or four programs hastily designed and financed by money left over from such things as the liquor budget.

In addition, Birenbaum created an atmosphere of openness. He contracted with the students and faculty to relinquish some of the powers he had under the charter and submit them to referenda. He set up six campus-wide commissions: campus planning, urban programs, evening college and the education of adults, the humanities and the arts in the college, academic programs in the college, and government-faculty and student. The first three were half student, half faculty bodies; the last three were one-third faculty, one-third students, one-third community. All of the college's correspondence and internal memoranda, with the exception of confidential personnel correspondence, were made available to anyone who wanted to walk into the President's office and look at it. Each October he delivered a speech outlining the year's agenda, which he evaluated in a May speech. Every three weeks he met students in a public question-and-answer session.

Because of creative leadership SICC is probably as prepared as any division of the CUNY for open admissions, but even there the picture is an uncertain one. The college is pooling its remedial services into a Skills Center and will attempt to stretch its money through the use of part-time personnel. Whereas many schools are having to increase class size, SICC is trying to get the faculty to move from nine hour teaching loads to the 12 hours load typical of most colleges. In addition a creative and performing arts program and a 200-400 student experimental college are being established to take off some of the pressure.

It remains to be seen if SICC can handle the increase. A class of 1,800-1,900 is expected; before Open Enrollment it would have been 1,300-1,400. Of these 43% will have average of over 75, 31% are between 70 and 75, and 25% are below 70. In the past only a fraction would have been below 70. With only $175,000 from the system, instead of the projected $900,000, the faculty and administration of SICC as well as that of other colleges, have their work cut out for them.

## REFERENCES

1. Christopher Jencks and David Reisman, The Academic Revolution, Garden City, N.Y.,: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968.

2. Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

3. A Greater University for a Greater City, The Building Program of thé City University of New York, December 1966.

4. The Future of the University is the Future of the City, A Report on Developments at the City University of New York, 1967.

5. A Proposal for the Establishment of Community College Number 7, November 1967.

6. The City University and the City, Graduate Center Report to Mayor John V. Lindsay and his Cabinet, December 22, 1967.

7. Margaret Furcron, To Help Them Achieve: The Academic Talent Search Program 1966-68, School of General Studies, Brooklyn College, 1968.

8. A Proposal for the Establishment of Community College Number 8, April 1968.

9. The 1969 Legislative Program of the City University of New York, a paper submitted by Porter R. Chandler, Chairman of the Board of Higher Education to the Governor and the Members of the New York State Legislature, January 29, 1969.

10. John Work, Status Reports of the State University of New York Urban Center in Manhattan, Administered by the Borough of Manhattan Community College of the City University of New York, December 1968 and August 1969.

11. Report on the SEEK Program at Queens College by the Chancellor's Advisory Council on SEEK, February 2, 1969.

12. James J. Smith, Jr., Progress Report on Identity '69, Staten Island Community College, April 1, 1969.

13. Open Admission: Target'70, Background Memo on the History of Opportunity at the City University of New York and Plans for the Future, October 20, 1969.

14. Richard Hofrichter, The SEEK Program at Hunter College of the City University of New York, Bureau of Social Science Research, December 1969.

15. What Does Open Admissions at the City University Mean? A Joint Publication of the Office of Admission Services and the Office of University Relations of the City University of New York, 1970.

* * *

# NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY:
# A PRIVATE UNIVERSITY SERVING THE URBAN PROLETARIAT

by

Dan Waldorf

Northeastern University in Boston is something of an exception in this present era of the high tuition, high cost, private university. Northeastern, a private university, has, since its beginning in 1898, striven to educate those persons who need it most but can least afford it--the poor, working class student. It has accomplished this through its cooperative scheme.

Northeastern, with the University of Cincinnati, was one of the first universities to establish a cooperative education program. Cincinnati initiated the idea in 1906, and Northeastern took up the idea three years later in 1909. The program began in the College of Engineering and was subsequently adapted over the years in most of the colleges and departments of the University as they were funded and developed. Not only does the co-op program allow Northeastern to serve urban working class students, but much of the curriculum is geared to the urban scene.

Most recently, the Northeastern Law School reopened as a cooperative. This is an innovation in law schools; Northeastern is the first university in the United States to use the cooperative idea to teach law. This is not the only innovation of that school. It is also attempting a revised curriculum which eschews the usual "establishment law" in favor of more problem oriented issues. Dean Thomas J. O'Toole summarized their efforts:

> We're into conscientious objection and drug abuse. We moved a whole class into an abortion trail. Students spend a night at a police station book desk...and last, but not least, we even let women into our law school. We made a special pitch to women's colleges and we got them. Twenty-five percent of the 92 students are women.

Presently the cooperative scheme embraces all of the day students at Northeastern--approximately 13,500--and is considered by the University to be the best way to provide both education and work experience to the student population it serves.

According to Roy L. Wooldridge, Vice President and Dean of Cooperative Education, Northeastern is one of the largest of 210 universities and colleges in the United States that have cooperative programs. He expects a boom in the growth of cooperatives within the next few years and estimates by 1972, that there will be as many as 500 similar programs. The idea is, according to Dean Wooldridge, politically safe. Democrats see it as a good way to educate the poor: Republicans see it as a means of cutting the high costs of higher education and avoiding Federal subsidy. It fits the "ideological bag" of both major political parties, so is very likely to get bi-partisan support from government and legislators.

Aside from the built-in payoffs in a cooperative program of providing meaningful work in a field of interest, earned income, and education, there is a hidden agenda: to create conditions for innovation in curriculum (the faculty are forced to change curricula to meet the demands of students based on experience), to help students develop self-confidence, to provide apparent and obvious role models to minority and black students who may rightfully feel cynical about their opportunity to get good jobs, to open the door for fund-raising for the University, and last but not least, to show the university the ways and means to determine the needs of and provide services to its local community.

Very briefly, the cooperative education program at Northeastern is a program of alternative terms of full-time work and full-time study. After a full-time freshman year at the University, students are given student placement in a job related to their major field, pharmacists in pharmaceutical jobs, physical education majors in education and recreation, etc.

The biggest problem is with liberal arts, non-science majors. Students in these areas are quite often without specific occupational goals or in the process of shopping around for the work they want to do. Placements for such students are less often related to the specific area of study than are those in other majors.

Placements are considered to be broader and more meaningful than a mere work experience and are very definitely part of the education program. Supervision is provided by both the University and the employer. Continuity of placement is encouraged, but is contingent upon the student's experience, likes and dislikes.

An example of a particularly good placement was the experience of Mr. Jim Alexander, an articulate, handsome black student in the School of Journalism. During the Spring of 1969, Mr. Alexander was placed with The Christian Science Monitor as a journalist. After a few weeks of rather routine writing jobs, Jim was assigned to Ford Hall at Brandeis University during the black students' take-over of that building. Students occupied the building for a week and Mr. Alexander was the only one of many newsmen who could get into Ford Hall to get the story from the black students' point of view. He got the story, did a good job writing it and was given a by-line on the front page of the newspaper. As a result of these articles he was given a regular assignment on urban affairs and contributed several articles on black student activities, some of which appeared on the front page, again under his own byline.

By no means are all the jobs as good or as interesting as either the students or the University hope for. They are not always the learning experience the University would like them to be; quite often business and industry do not know how to use placements to best advantage, and often there is not enough supervision provided by the employer.

The cooperative scheme sets the tone for most of the community activities at Northeastern. It provides, at the same time, relationships with local business and industry and avenues for jobs and social mobility to the working class persons of the community.

The general feeling at Northeastern, among some of its most severe critics, the black students, is that the University is doing a good job at meeting local community needs and providing services. One student critic commented:

> There is no university in the country that's doing what Northeastern is doing. Like we (black student groups) didn't ask for the Lighted Schoolhouse or the Drop-out School; they got started on their own. But it's not like we're going to give them a lot of publicity for it; we don't want them to rest on their laurels. Northeastern can't be a measuring stick for other colleges and universities, simply because it's got a long way to go.

Obviously there are other universities doing as good a job as Northeastern in serving their local communities, but this student expressed the general opinion of black students and many other students and faculty at Northeastern. Of the two programs cited above--the Lighted Schoolhouse and the Drop-out School--only one was a success, the second, and it has been closed.

For the balance of this chapter we will describe Northeastern's other areas of urban, community, and minority group involvement, but we feel that the co-op program is the lever that opened the door to the other types of involvement.

## The Drop-Out School

This school, known formally as the Laboratory School of the Boston Neighborhood Youth Corps, began in February 1966, with active assistance from Melvin Howards, a thin, wiry, ex-New Yorker. The initial plan was to develop a modest tutorial program for Neighborhood Youth Corps workers in Roxbury, the black community of Boston. The program took a year to get funded after several false starts and considerable disappointment to the boys and girls involved in the plans of the school. Eventually those involved with the program became annoyed with the long, involuted bureacratic procedures of funding and went directly to ABCD, the Boston Community Action Program, and demanded help to get the program funded. ABCD in turn went to the Department of Labor for money to start the program.

With funding, classes were opened in the ground floor of the YMCA and 30 persons were initially brought into the program. During the second year, enrollment increased to 250, but during the third and last year of the program, it eased back to 200. In its second year the program was housed in a former industrial building at 40 Leon Street on the edge of the Northeastern Campus, and in its third year it was moved to renovated quarters in Roxbury (a former automobile showroom) together with other social service activities.

The Laboratory School provided eight hours of instruction a week to school drop-outs participating in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The major purpose of this program was:

> ...to provide youth who have dropped out of school with either basic education (for those functioning below 7th grade level) or high school level work for those who have completed the 8th grade and who are functioning above the 7th grade level. Employability is the goal of the Neighborhood Youth Corps and therefore this directly affects the school program and philosophy...The vast majority of the students seek better jobs with a future.

Classes were organized in track and core groups. Track groups were 6 to 8 boys or girls grouped according to reading level or ability in English or mathematics. Only persons who were functioning below 7th grade levels were placed in track groups. Persons who functioned above a 7th grade level were organized into core groups of 20 persons.

The curriculum for both groups was a modified curriculum for high school credit---English language and reading, mathematics and science---organized around an integrated core concept such as conflict, migration, people who made America, getting a job, starting a bank account, or applying for a loan.

Attendance for the school was very high--75% of all students attended regularly. Relationships between students and teachers were said to be "one of the best things about the school." The atmosphere was so accepting and helpful that girls with infant children often brought them to school where they made arrangements among themselves and other students for babysitting. Teachers were enthusiastic about the program and the principal was a "very able and outspoken" black man who gave the school a dynamic leadership.

Graduates of the program were successful in getting either jobs or further education. By January, 1969, 29 persons had graduated from the school; of that number, 4 were fulltime students at universities in the area, 5 were awaiting application for full-time college study, 5 were in some job training, and 9 were working full-time.

The school ran for 3½ years as a demonstration project. With legislative cutbacks and changes in Neighborhood Youth Corps guidelines during 1969, the program first had to exclude 18 year olds, and then was closed completely because of no funds.

## The Charles E. Mackey Lighted School House

The Lighted School House was a different story. During our first visit to Northeastern in March of 1969, nearly everyone was enthusiastic about the Boston Bouve College's modification of the Flint, Michigan Community School, the Lighted School House (whereby a school is kept open at night for a full range of adult education and community programs).

The idea for the school came from Dr. Katharine L. Allen, Dean of Northeastern's Boston Bouve College of Physical and Recreation Education in June, 1967. But it was a long time coming to fruition. The original plan was to establish the school in Roxbury. Leaders in that black community were contacted, but after a number of months of discussions and formulation, the community resisted the idea because there was no plan for a physical facility aside from classrooms. Unfortunately, a proposal for funding was sent to the Mott Foundation before the attitudes of the community were assessed. The Foundation made a site visit and learned of the community resistance; they did not fund the proposal.

Having failed in Roxbury, the idea was taken to the South End of Boston, a community of Greek, Arab, Puerto Rican and black people (there are said to be 42 different ethnic groups living there). Planning meetings were held with the local community--one such meeting had 200 participants and the proceedings were translated simultaneously in four different languages. As a result of these meetings, a proposal was written and Dr. Asa Knowles, the President of the University, committed $25,000 from the University budget to start the program.

A full-time black director was hired and courses for children and adults began. Classes for children ranged from kindergarten to the eighth grade. Courses in basic reading and math were established with a wide range of field trips to stimulate the children. They visited an astronomy observatory, local university laboratories, TV stations, and used the swimming pools and gyms of Boston Bouve College.

The major emphasis of the adult program was to provide English courses for Spanish, Chinese and Greek speaking adults. Initial enrollment was low, but William Bush, the director, wasn't discouraged because each week the number of members increased as the participants spread the word to the local community.

The University gave full cooperation in providing materials and facilities for the school, and was exploring various sources for funding and other assistance to expand the school's range of activities.

Northeastern had no intention of expanding into or otherwise taking over the community. It simply wanted to provide whatever it could to an underprivileged community with the hope of breaking down some of the barriers between town and gown.

My impression after my first visit was that after 19 months of talk and planning and two months of operation, the plan could be made to work. When I returned a year later in April, 1970 a pall had fallen over the whole idea and everyone involved with the project seemed disappointed and discouraged after the intervening year.

There are several versions of the school's demise. One version attributed responsibility to local leaders; another attributed the failure to leadership at Northeastern. The falure in local leadership version went this way:

> Mr. Brush, the Director, did a good job getting the thing going. He would go from door to door explaining the idea, encouraging people to participate in the school. It was evident though from the beginning at the meetings that the community was suspicious of the establishment (Northeastern).
>
> ...the advisory board of the school was stacked with affluent people who didn't represent the people and were trying to wrest control of the school from the University. They were tryin to run things, and wanted to get their hands in the till. People in that community do not communicate among themselves and they didn't know what was going on. There was one problem after another.
>
> It all came to a head toward the first of the summer. Mr. Brush was offered a good job with the school he had left in New York City in order to come up here. We couldn't compete with their offer. I guess he realized the school wasn't going to rise over all the bickering. We didn't plan a summer program and resisted the advisory board's suggestion for one. They insisted on the program and made plans. Well they sat-in on us; so we threw it into their laps. They hired a new director, a hard working, capable black girl, and they spent $10,500 of the $25,000 for the summer program. All during the summer there were fights about money; they wanted control of the money but we didn't give it to them. They had crazy ideas, like paying a superintendent $6.40 an hour just to open and close the doors of Mackey School.
>
> We got a hard time all that summer. Toward fall, they came to us and asked us for another $25,000 for the second year. They wanted us to just give them the money. Well, we wanted more control than that, so we told them that we couldn't give them the money without administering the program. In the end we told them to raise the money themselves and administer the program themselves.

> I don't really believe that the board really represented the people in the community; they were just affluent people who were using the school for their own ends. They didn't represent the people and in the end they caused us too much trouble.

The other version attributed the failure to Northeastern's leadership:

> Boston Bouve just couldn't handle those people down in Castle Square. They couldn't handle the conflict stirred up by the Board. The Friends of Mackey School were suspicious of Northeastern. They wanted power to the people. Who are the people?: In this case, the middle class or upwardly mobile working class. I guess it would have helped if Boston Bouve would have been represented by someone from a minority group.

Undoubtedly, elements of both stories are true. Community groups, in their new consciousness, can be demanding and difficult; and it takes special skill and a certain finesse to work with them. But democratic processes have never been easy and perhaps a few hard knocks can be expected when universities take things to the people.

## Continuing Education

Much more effective than the Lighted School House and longer lived than the Drop-Out School are the unique and varied activities of the Center of Continuing Education. The Dean of this school is Israel Katz, know to all as "Iz." Mr. Katz is a large, pleasant, outgoing man with the assurance and easy manner of one who knows his job well and is pleased with his achievements. Before coming to Northeastern, he was a professor of engineering at Cornell University and an engineering manager at General Electric.

Dean Katz's philosophy of continuing education is unusual: continuing education for him is not adult education or extension work, but a unique provision of courses to upgrade or stretch the competencies of practitioners and professionals in nearly every field. Courses are generally presented in seminar or workshop format where the student becomes involved as a participant teacher. Resource people for these courses must be very adaptable to the needs of the group taking the course and steer away from an authoritarian or lecture-like situation.

Courses provided by the Center range from an Institute on Youth and Drugs for school counsellors to an elaborate, semester-long series of courses on the "State-of-the-Art" to help engineers and scientists stay abreast of technological advances both in their own fields and peripheral areas. In the first, a group of counselors was brought to a large elegant old home (Henderson House) for an intensive 12-day course of study providing information about all aspects of drugs, explored their own attitudes about drugs and drug abusers, and visited Boston State Hospital's Addiction Unit and Odyssey House in New York City. The "State-of-the-Art" series offered 67 different courses in engineering, ranging from statistics to laser light optics, and were held at a number of locations, including suburban schools.

The State-of-the-Arts courses best express Dean Katz's belief that education is a life-long experience and that adult education should be a normal and necessary part of a person's working life. In this respect, Northeastern attempts to relate the latest developments in a profession or practice with the participant's knowledge and experience in his field of work.

The Youth and Drug Institute expresses the Center's interest in attacking social and urban problems. Many such programs and courses are undertaken as a community service.

Courses at the Center are grouped and developed under four different departments:

> (1) Community Services has developed courses for a variety of practitioners of social and community functions. These may range from institutes for construction foremen to overcome racial prejudices to updating administrative skills for nursing home administrators;

(2) Continuing Education in Science and Technology is the largest of the four in terms of the number of students. Dean Katz tells the following story which illustrates Northeastern's reputation for providing high level courses in engineering:

> "Very recently we submitted in competition with MIT, a proposal to NASA to train certain members of its staff in specific new techniques. When we made the submission, one of the junior members of the University staff--he didn't have any idea of our ability--said that we didn't stand a chance against MIT. Well, I was more confident than that. We have had plenty of experience in putting together just the thing that they were looking for. We won the contract because they knew we would do the job. Northeastern may not be as high-powered as MIT, but what we do we do well."

(3) Continuing Education in Business utilizes a broad range of techniques and subject matter, including "T" and interpersonal relations groups, clinical psychology, and studies of autocratic and paternalistic behavior, to teach diverse courses from general labor-management problems to a specific development program for senior women supervisors from the New England Telephone Company.

(4) Continuing Education in Professional Science and Engineering generally acts as a direct consultant to engineering firms to determine specific needs of a situation and provide counsel in courses as may be needed. For example, at Raytheon, management had assumed that persons performing a specific job had working knowledge of applied trigonometry. This assumption was not borne out and was causing production problems. Raytheon contacted the Center for Continuing Education and the Center organized a workshop on trigonometry applied to crystal growth and fabrication.

Faculty for most Center courses are recruited from among practitioners rather than from Northeastern itself. Eighty one per cent of all Center instructors come from business, industry, social agencies, or research institutions. These instructors work part-time on a course-to-course basis. The Center has been very successful in getting very competent teachers and has a growing reputation in the Boston area for providing a high level of training for graduate practitioners.

It has also been financially self-supporting. According to Dean Katz, the Center showed a net income on top of more than a $1,000,000 budget for 1969, but after deducting costs of low income community service courses, this amounted to a break-even position. Despite this self-supporting performance, the program has met some resistance from regular University faculty. Dean Katz explained:

> The faculty as a whole does not understand the Center and consequently is not in favor of what we are doing, but gradually we hope to win it over. It's a new step; we're doing difficult things and there are not many people who believe universities should be as aggressive as we are about going out to the local community and selling our courses. Someday the Center will be appropriately recognized at home.

I visited Henderson House for one day of a week-long course being given to construction crew foremen. The course was developed by the Center for the Association of General Contractors, who wanted to prepare construction crew foremen for the racial integration of work crews. Accomodations at Henderson House were spacious and food was good and plentiful.

Participants in this course were for the most part without formal higher education (only one of the group of 15 had any college training), but they were experienced in dealing with people. The course utilized this experience to teach basic human relations and sensitize them to their own attitudes toward social change and racial prejudice. Each day began with an informal lecture which drew on the experience of the group to describe and illustrate basic concepts in dealing with people. After the lecture, the students broke up in two groups to discuss different aspects of the lecture, with each group led by a trained psychologist. The groups then reassembled as a single unit for a larger discussion. After a break for dinner, a long, discursive lecture on the history of group dynamics and processes of social change was presented by various combinations of the four instructors present.

Most of the lecture material was presented in an oblique and informal way. Concepts were only hinted at and a number of anecdotes were used to get points across. Discussions at the lectures were lively but tended to be monopolized by a few individuals. The small groups seemed to be less fruitful than the lectures in evoking discussion. They were intended to be a form of modified sensitivity training, but the group I sat in on was of a very superficial level. Little if any emotions or feelings were expressed. Discussion in the second group was more lively and more expressive of the participants' feelings.

By far the best discussions occurred during dinner while participants were less self-conscious. Leavened by good food and drink, I engaged a group of six participants in a discussion about drug addiction and race--more specifically, the reasons why there is more drug abuse among racial and ethnic minorities. Another group was debating the long term effects of youth culture at the other end of the table. Obviously, the course was creating a good climate for discussion.

This idea of expanding the concept of continuing education to persons already established in a job, practice or profession is an unusual idea and would seem to be in keeping with the rapid changes in society and technology which are occurring. Dean Katz summed up his position and the efforts of the Center in this way:

> With the seemingly steady increases in technology and the rapid social changes that are occurring today, individuals should be prepared to make several career changes over the course of their lifetime. Universities have to recognize this and make these changes possible for the individual. If we don't, we are going to have a country of bitter, discontented middle-age people who feel discarded by society. Our Center is meeting that problem, but other universities have to join in. Education is a life-long process and universities should not be concerned only with the young or the middle classes.

Black Student Program

In addition to meeting the needs of practitioners and professionals in a rapidly changing society, Northeastern is doing a reasonably good job at providing education opportunity to black persons as well. As of the first of 1970, roughly 3% of the students at Northeastern were black. The percentage is expected to increase: Dr. Asa Knowles, Northeastern's President, has pledged that by the fall of 1970, at least 10% of the freshman class will be black. The University seemed well on its way towards that goal; the Fall, 1969 incoming class was 5% (175) black.

The special black students program was initiated at Northeastern in the fall of 1964, when 25 students were admitted with full scholarships for five years (in the co-op program) with funds provided by the Ford Foundation. These students were euphemistically called Ford Scholars. One such scholar said of the group:

> Yes, most of the group that I came in with have remained at the University and are doing well (12 of the original 25 graduated in June, 1969). But you wouldn't believe how the original 25 were selected. You have to give it to Whitey; he's always scheming. Nearly all of the original 25 were athletes, you know. The University used the 25 scholarships to strengthen their athletic teams. They used those scholarships to bring in more athletes. Well, when we got organized, got ourselves together in 1966, this was the first issue we confronted the University on.

During 1965, twenty-five more black students were brought in under scholarships with equal numbers in 1966 and 1967. Beginning in 1965, a special summer preparatory program was initiated for black students and this has been continued every year since.

After the death of Martin Luther King in the spring of 1968, black students of the Afro-American Association approached President Knowles and the University with 13 demands. One of these was an increase in the number of black freshmen to 50 for the fall of 1969. Dr. Knowles responded very positively to the students, as one black student relates:

> Asa Knowles is a beautiful cat; he wants to cooperate. When we made our demands, he responded immediately and almost always in the affirmative. And what's more, he carried them out. Like we got more black students than we asked for last year. We asked for 50 and got 85.

Black freshmen enrollment increased to 175 by the fall of 1969, and it was expected that approximately 300 black students (or 10%) would be brought into the freshman class in 1970. Admission procedures for black students have been streamlined: College Board scores are not used and students are accepted on the basis of their potential and motivation. If the student demonstrates a genuine concern to get in and succeed, he is accepted.

Financial aid is also generous. Martin Luther King Scholarships (of which there were 75 in the fall of 1969) provide full tuition, fees, books and commuting expenses. If additional assistance is needed, it is given. As Roland Latham, the black Assistant Dean of Students says:

> We try to meet all the needs of the students. If someone needs clothes, glasses, what have you, we come up with the money for them. We try to give them special housing consideration, try to get them housing close to the University...Another policy we have--this one's brand new--is the extended freshman year. If a student shows problems in adjustment and doesn't do as well as expected, we extend the freshman year. We let them do the freshman year in two years if they have to. This started just this year.

In general, relations between the University and the black student group (the Afro-American Association) are amicable. In many respects, President Knowles has anticipated black students demands long before they have been made. He has consequently been in a good position to produce action. Dean Latham illustrated this with his description of black students at Northeastern:

> The numbers of militant black students have dwindled and I think you can attribute this directly to the responsiveness of the University. Freshmen join the militant groups when they first come because they want to belong and be accepted. After a few semesters they drop out because there is little to complain about at Northeastern. More blacks are being enrolled; the Afro-American Center is open. The President does these things because he is a concerned person; he does it because it is the right thing to do.

One black student described it differently, but it amounts to the same thing:

> We were forced to group together because any meeting we would have with faculty and administration would only have resulted in long fruitless philosophical discussions. We knew that if we came as a body with firm ideas of what we wanted and made no concessions and no compromises, we could get them. Well we got them...now we don't even have to raise our voices anymore; we're experts at universities. We just go straight to the man and rap with him.

In February, 1969, black students proposed to the University the establishment of an Afro-American Center and a Black Studies Department. President Knowles agreed and encouraged the proposal and during our first visit to Northeastern, both students and faculty-administration were planning both. With little fanfare and few of the problems faced by other universities in the formation of similar programs, Northeastern provided a small building for the Center and staff to begin its operation within a few short months (September, 1969) of the original demand.

During our second visit the Center was operational. It offered a limited range of courses and service to the Boston black community and planned a comprehensive black studies program.

Good relations between black students, the black community, and President Knowles are largely the result of efforts by Kenneth C. Williams, who was first an Assistant to the President and later a Coordinator of the Afro-American Institute. Mr. Williams is a young, dynamic, rather hip, bearded black man who served as intermediary between black students and the President. His relations with both students and the President were excellent. With students he was casual and at ease; he could bang the table and rap with the best of them. With the President he was calm and articulate---a thoroughly reasonable man who resisted the temptation to be co-opted by either group.

## Teacher Intern Program

The last program to be described at any length is one that may be a good technique for improving both teacher training and the quality of education in ghetto schools. This program, called The Prototype Program for Teacher Education, is attempting to bring Northeastern's College of Education together with two private ghetto schools (Roxbury Community School and the New School for Children) in a program to revise curriculum and training for teachers who plan to work in inner city schools.

According to William Quill, the Program Coordinator and Assistant Professor of Education, traditional teacher training programs have had little relevance for preparing teachers to work in such schools. His program will attempt to change teacher training by:

1) giving inner city residents a significant role in the program---each of the three groups have equal voice in all decision making;
2) allowing the interns during their undergraduate education to develop a curriculum which will be appropriate and meaningful for children in inner-city schools;

3) the program will de-emphasize academic achievement for evaluating interns, and specify the behavior skills and characteristics that make effective urban teachers.

The program grew out of discussions between representatives of the Roxbury Community School, The New School for Children, and Northeastern's Associate Dean of Education, Roy C. Dethy, about the possibility of allowing uncertified teachers currently working in the community schools to attend Northeastern to obtain an undergraduate degree. The College of Education had no such program, but Dean Dethy proposed that the community schools and Northeastern get together to develop a prototype program which would allow interns to develop their own curriculum and course of study leading to a degree.

Preliminary funding was solicited from the U. S. Office of Education and received in June of 1969, for a six month period. Since then, informal seminars have been held at the community schools twice a week to designate the operational behavior of both interns and the University, to concretize the teaching experience of the interns, and to develop new criteria for intern evaluation. Of the progress to date, Mr. Quill said:

> The program has made a lot of progress in the community and there has been a lot of enthusiasm among the University faculty; but the faculty talk too much and can't deliver. They are caught in abstractions; they can't get together when it comes to talk and action. Really, the community has been very tolerant of us.

Interns entering the program do not necessarily have to have a high school diploma, although about half do. The proposed program would be under the direction of the College of Education, but located in the University College, which has an open admissions policy so that formal credentials will be no bar to those wishing to participate.

Although the program, at our last visit, was still in its initial stages, the University has made a real commitment to it. As reported by Mr. Quill, Northeastern, despite a lack of funds for new program development, has made a real effort to make this program operational:

> Northeastern hangs loose in regard to community projects. The degree of cooperation by the University is impressive. Why, we have the majority of full-time instruction faculty of the School (of Education) devoting one-third of their time to the Prototype Program. Yes, they do want to do something to improve the quality of education in ghetto schools.

Leadership

Involvement with Boston and its problems is expressed by most of the departments and schools of the University--many more than have been mentioned in this short description. This involvement is a result not only of the relationships between the community and Northeastern that arise out of the cooperative scheme of education, but the direction given to the University by its president, Dr. Asa Knowles.

Dr. Knowles is an unassuming, conservatively dressed, round-faced man whose physical appearance belies his innovative ideas for Northeastern and its urban emphasis. Both students and faculty think that Dr. Knowles has been the forceful leader who has led the University's attack on Boston's social problems. One faculty member summarized the attitude:

> Old Ace (Asa) is really into things; he's tuned into urban problems and really responds. His door is open at anytime to new ideas, and when he says he'll back you up, he does. He doesn't have any pretensions about Northeastern; he knows that it is a proletarian university and he wants to educate kids who really need it.

Dr. Knowles' leadership in dealing with urban problems has not been as easy or as popular as it has perhaps been made to sound here. Some at Northeastern resist his ideas and plans for Northeastern.

The President tells his own story of this resistance:

> Five years ago (1964), when I encouraged the University departments and staff to get involved with the city, the head of the Sociology Department said for all to hear, 'Yes, if Dr. Knowles wants to get involved with the city, give him a broom and let him sweep Huntington Avenue (a particularly dirty street that borders the University).' So, you see, it has not always been a popular thing to do at Northeastern; but despite that, I have always felt that Northeastern should take the leadership in providing whatever services we could to the local community. Now the rest of the universities in Boston--Harvard, Boston University and Boston College--are getting on the bandwagon because they know that is where the money is.

Barbara Rubin, an Associate Professor of Sociology, a native of Boston and Roxbury and a keen urban sociologist, is a little less optimistic than President Knowles about the climate at Northeastern:

> The history of Northeastern has been one of educating the working class of Boston. It was a private institution doing the job of a state institution. It had done the job of educating Boston, while the State did nothing. It has played a magnificent role with the Boston community, but when the State got involved in educating the poor, the new University of Massachusetts downtown now, Northeastern has become more regional and national in its scope.
>
> For a long time there was no publish or perish approach here; but now we are normalizing and it is affecting the University in a lot of ways: some of the faculty are unwilling to cooperate with students and cooperative coordinators; increasingly, undergraduates are being sacrificed to graduate students and graduate departments. Some of the faculty come here to be close to Harvard and MIT; Northeastern is their second choice and they are not satisfied with what Northeastern is doing. They look across the river to Cambridge; that is the standard and the model for a lot of the faculty here. It's unfortunate we are so close to those two schools; we would be a lot more comfortable with our achievement if we did not have to live by their standards.

Indeed, being so close to Harvard and MIT is a problem for Northeastern. Many of the faculty do want to emulate the larger national and international scope of those universities. Some feel that Northeastern's achievement cannot stand next to the traditional model of excellence which Harvard and MIT typify. Ironically, their students' consciousness of Boston's urban problems is forcing Harvard and MIT to look to universities such as Northeastern and Wayne State in Detroit for a model of urban involvement.

# OUR LADY OF THE LAKE:
# A DIFFERENT TYPE OF SERVICE

George Nash

Although Our Lady of the Lake (The Lake), a medium size, predominantly women's Catholic college in San Antonio, Texas, has always had a variety of distinctive programs, it has still clung fairly closely to tradition. The great majority of the undergraduates are Catholic. Catholic students are required to take approximately one religion course per year. Many of the parents send their daughters there with the feeling that they will be protected from the dangers of the outside world.

In 1967, The Lake began a radical experiment called "Project Teacher Excellence" (PTE), that enrolled Mexican-American students who would not ordinarily qualify for admission to or be able to afford The Lake. PTE aimed to prepare them to become bilingual teachers in the Mexican-American community. This has been a bold experiment fraught with difficulty, but it is succeeding due to the support of key faculty and administrators, and the tremendous ability of the students themselves. The project has presented a tremendous challenge to what had been a fairly placid conservative school, which nonetheless is the most liberal college in San Antonio. Its success has made PTE's supporters and students proud, and caused many of its original detractors to rethink their opposition. Project Teacher Excellence has had an impact on other units at The Lake, such as The Worden School of Social Service. It has said if they can do it, why can't we?

Although PTE has been a success to date, its long-range future is by no means secure.

This chapter will tell the story of Project Teacher Excellence, the conflicts that it has engendered, why it has succeeded, and how it has affected the rest of the College.

## BACKGROUND:

Service to the community has been a major component of The Lake's program since it was founded by the Sisters of the Divine Providence as a two-year Catholic college in 1911. Teacher training, first only for those who taught in the parochial schools and then for a wide variety of teachers, has always been a major activity. The Worden School of Social Work, opened in 1942, is the only such institution in San Antonio and one of just four in all of Texas. When Texas developed certification standards for teachers in 1950, and The Lake began to offer a Master's Degree in Education, the administration began to realize that a new type of teacher training was needed to reach San Antonio's Mexican-American population.

San Antonio has one of the largest ethnic concentrations of any major city in the United States, with approximately 40 percent of its 800,000 citizens being Mexican-American today, and a majority expected in the future. (Mexican-Americans also refer to themselves by the terms "Chicano" and "Brown". However, those of Mexican descent in Texas seem to prefer to be called Mexican-Americans and that is the term we shall use throughout.)

The most acute educational problem in the Southwest is that which involves Mexican-American children. In the elementary and secondary schools of the five states in the region -- Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas, there are approximately 1.75 million children with Spanish surnames. Although approximately two-thirds of the public school population of San Antonio is Mexican-American, the statistics on their performance are abysmal. The drop-out rate in high school is huge and only a small proportion go on to college. One of the problems is that the parents, many of whom are recent immigrants, have an extremely low level of educational attainment. A recent survey of all Mexican-Americans in Texas over 25 years of age showed that half had completed no more than four years of school, and only one in nine had gone to high school. Thus, the parents of Mexican-American children are not sufficiently educated to help these students breach the cultural barriers to employment and full participation in American society. Since most Mexican-Americans don't attend college, school teachers are predominantly white or "Anglo", and many of them have been quite ineffective in reaching and motivating Mexican-American students.

THE NATURE OF THE COLLEGE:

Set on an 115 acre campus bordering Lake Elmendorf, Our Lady of the Lake is located on the west side of San Antonio. Its location in a predominantly Mexican-American, low-income part of town has affected the nature of the College both positively and negatively. Location is one of the reasons that the upper-middle class Catholic girls of San Antonio usually attend Trinity University rather than The Lake. The Lake's Anglo resident students have primarily been Catholic girls from North and East Texas and out of state, whose parents want them to get the benefits of a Catholic higher education, which includes protection from the dangers of the big city. Both Anglo and Mexican-American girls from San Antonio attend the Lake as day students. The College has long had a substantial population of middle and working-class Mexican-American students from the San Antonio area whose parents, through economizing, have been able to afford the tuition of only $750 a year. About half of the undergraduate girls board at the college and these are primarily the out-of-town Anglos. The Mexican-American students have usually been commuters, but there have been some South Texas Mexican-Americans who've lived on campus.

The Lake is a fairly strong college academically and over the years it has raised its entrance requirements. By 1968, two-thirds of the entering freshmen had been in the top quarter of their graduating class in high school. Financial and academic considerations ruled out many Mexican-Americans.

Prior to the time Project Teacher Excellence enrolled its first students in September 1967, Our Lady of the Lake College had been predominantly an excellent college with an ideal of service but it had done little to educate poorly prepared students.

Project Teacher Excellence was not a program that sprang up overnight in barren soil. Rather, there had been a context at The Lake which made such innovation possible. The Sisters of Divine Providence, who began in southern France, were invited to Texas in the late 1800's to teach the poor. In 1896 they established the first normal school in Texas at San Antonio and it eventually became Our Lady of the Lake. Because there was not a single social service agency in the City at the time, Bishop Lucey asked them in 1942 to start a school where training for social service could take place. Both the Sisters of Divine Providence and the Archdiocese of San Antonio have been regarded as innovative.

However, much of the service rendered to the community by the sisters in the early days was of the "Lady Bountiful" nature. The sisters contributed baskets of food to local residents at Thanksgiving. According to some younger Mexican-Americans, the community regarded The Lake as a patronizing mission with high fences which was inaccessible to most of the poor children who lived nearby. The college administrators have become aware of this image and have started to change it. Some sisters now live in low-income communities, in among local Mexican-Americans, and this has helped to change perspectives on both sides.

Academically The Lake has been sound and has gotten stronger. John McMahon, a layman, has been president for 25 years. He has been a proponent of academic freedom and excellence and political liberality. There is a fairly strong faculty with approximately half of the full-time members holding the doctorate. Although the Sisters of Divine Providence own the college, about half of the Board of Trustees are laymen. However, six of the eleven members of the Board, including the chairman, are sisters. Approximately half of the faculty are laymen. The sisters are not a conservative force. Some of the lay faculty we talked to feel that many of the most innovative and liberal faculty are sisters. The sisters wear a variety of costumes, with some dressed fairly traditionally, others wearing modern, fashionable habits with skirts at the knee, and others eschewing habits altogether.

The seeds of today's innovations trace to a self-study The Lake made in preparation for an accreditation visit in the early 1960's. The administrators determined that service to the community would have to be an important future goal of the College and that not enough of the right sort of service was being done. The first step was a visit by two sisters (who were eventually to become the second and third-ranking administrators at The Lake) to a number of other colleges. The sisters were particularly impressed by Antioch, Carleton, and Macalester Webster and they became convinced of the importance of faculty and student involvement in policy-making and of the need for new methods of rendering service.

One of the first things that the sisters proposed upon their return to The Lake was a faculty conference to debate the future goals of the College and the strengthening of the role of the faculty. In 1964, the faculty assembled off campus for a three-day conference which was to mark a real turning point. Out of that came a vastly expanded role for the faculty in the governance of the College. The administration also accepted the idea of student involvement in decision-making. Joint faculty-student committees now make most of the important decisions at The Lake. Because the student body was fairly conservative, they had to be urged and cajoled into serving on committees. At first, students couldn't see what relevance tenure appointments had for them. This led to a tradition of the faculty being ahead of the students in liberalization at The Lake which persisted until the arrival of the Project Teacher Excellence students.

The priority attached to academic excellence and freedom and the increased role of the faculty in decision-making have undoubtedly been factors in the sense of involvement felt by the lay faculty. The Lake is unusual for a predominantly women's Catholic college in that it has eleven male faculty members and seven sisters on its faculty with doctorates earned out of the state of Texas at non-Catholic institutions. Fifty of the sisters on the faculty have done graduate work at non-Catholic institutions. One of the lay Catholic faculty members with a doctorate said that The Lake is an excellent place to teach because it provides her with all the necessary resources and gives her absolute freedom in the classroom. Although The Lake may be a long way from Antioch or Macalester, it is considerably more liberated and mature than many Catholic colleges.

The Lake is still conservative, however, even though it now admits academically underqualified students and is going coeducational. The music piped into the diningroom and the posters hung in the corridors contain little hint of the revolution that is going on within higher education. The buildings are traditional. The faculty and students dress conservatively. The alumni is a major force inhibiting innovation. Four alumni called The Lake to protest an appearance of folk singer Pete Seeger. This chapter is a study of innovation at a conservative institution. The Lake is a conservative institution compared to Wayne State or Northeastern, but fairly radical for a Catholic college. Perhaps this conservatism is best described by one of its top male administrators:

> ..I would be the first to admit that OLL has a conservative element on its campus (we would not be much of a forum for the free flow of ideas if we systematically excluded the conservative point of view), but Dr. Nash seems to find this conservatism omnipresent and all-powerful, and I simply cannot buy this interpretation. The 'Statement of Beliefs' and 'Mission Statement' of the College are certainly not conservative philosophically. The official planning report of the Steering Committee on Development, which will serve as the master plan for the next ten years, is hardly a timid backward-looking document in its projections for student body mix, for radical

> curricular reform, and for program innovations. The Board of Trustees has never turned down any liberalizing change presented to it. The faculty has voted down a few back-tracking proposals, but I cannot recall it voting down any innovative ones. Though the administration has not always had the funds to finance all the proposals submitted at any given time, it has never to my knowledge made an outright veto of any new idea...
>
> I submit that any slowness in responding to innovation is..a result of the financial squeeze in which all higher educational institutions are being caught.. No responsible administrator encourages the initiation of a program or project, unless some reasonable planning can also be done for the providing of resources for that program or project. The reason for the success of the projects that OLL has undertaken is that they were not half-baked ideas emerging from nowhere, but carefully (and perhaps slowly) thought out objectives that could be carried out on the limited resources available to a small private college.

## The History of Project Teacher Excellence

In 1963 Harold Wren, the Chairman of the Education Department, conceived the idea for Project Teacher Excellence which would train Mexican-American Students, who would not normally have been eligible for admission to college, to become teachers who would return to their own community. Wren originally wanted $900,000 for a five-year project. His original proposal was sent to the Office of Economic Opportunity, which kept it for some time and then told Our Lady of the Lake to resubmit it to the Office of Education, as that was the appropriate funding source. Guy Pryor, a professor of education with a doctorate in education from North Texas State University promptly resubmitted the proposal but it was turned down by the Office of Education. In December 1966, some months after submission of the second proposal, Tom

Jones, a special assistant to Secretary of H.E.W., John Gardner, came across The Lake's proposal when he was asked by Gardner to review promising proposals for the education of Mexican-Americans that had been rejected. Jones had Guy Pryor and Sister Mary Clare Metz, the academic dean, meet him in Dallas where he was attending another meeting to discuss a further resubmission of the proposal.

Jones explained that the project had been turned down, not because of lack of merit, but because it did not correspond to existing programs funded by the Office of Education. However, Jones stated that both he and Secretary Gardner wanted to see the proposal funded. He urged them to resubmit it. Again it was turned down because it didn't correspond closely enough to anything offered by the Office of Education.

Because of the interests of Secretary Gardner and the Office of Mexican-American Affairs in the Office of Education, Dave Johnson, the head of the Talent Search Program, became interested in the program. The Talent Search Program stretched its regulations somewhat and awarded $40,000 to Our Lady of the Lake for a two-year period so that they could locate and recruit the students for the program.

The basic funding for the program was then secured through the three federal financial aid programs of the Office of Education: the Educational Opportunity Grant Program, the College Work-Study Program, and the National Defense Student Loan Program. The budget for these three programs at Our Lady of the Lake in 1970-71 will be approximately $800,000, with a very large proportion of that money going to the Project Teacher Excellence students. The College has also provided scholarships and federally guaranteed loans have been secured through the Texas Opportunity Program. The Southwest Educational Development Laboratories also assisted the program at the outset in the amount of $20,000. In addition, Our Lady of the Lake, St. Mary's College and the Model Cities Program will have an additional $160,000 in the forthcoming years, from the Special Services for the Disadvantaged Program of the Office of Education (also administered by Dave Johnson) which will provide tutoring and academic makeup work for which no funds have previously been available. The Talent Search Program has been continued and is now called Puerta Abierta for Economically Deprived and Culturally Differentiated Americans, but it has not been expanded to serve a number of colleges and high schools located throughout south Texas.

The Lake has been able to operate Project Teacher Excellence at the rate it envisioned, bringing in 40 students per year since the fall of 1967, with the funds provided by the federal government. However, it had to adapt its request for funds to existing programs, rather than being able to get money in the form it had originally proposed. It wasn't until personal relationships were established with program administrators in the Office of Education that people at The Lake were able to figure out how to proceed.

## The Performance of Project Teacher Excellence

Sixty percent of the students who were admitted to the project during the first year did not qualify for admission to Our Lady of the Lake by the usual standards for admission, yet these students had a smaller percentage of failures and a smaller percentage on scholasitc probation than did the freshman class as a whole. By the end of the third year of the project, in the spring of 1970, 85 percent of all enrollees in the program since its inception were still enrolled in the program at The Lake. Of those who have dropped out, one-third have transferred to other colleges. In other words, only 10 percent of those who have entered the program have not continued in college. Some of those who transferred were unhappy with The Lake itself, and this included some men who decided against teaching and there was no other program for them at The Lake then. As of the spring of 1970, there were approximately 1,000 full-time undergraduates at The Lake. Of these, about 50 percent were Mexican-American and six percent black. The PTE students constituted about one-quarter of the Mexican-American student body.

Despite the fact that the retention rate has been high, the grades of the PTE students have been somewhat lower than average. The PTE students have encountered tremendous problems and it has been the administrators of the program and the individual attention that has been given that have kept the students enrolled. The most frequent troubles have been: 1) a poor foundation in English; 2) a cultural conflict over the value of higher education; 3) mechanical impediments such as transportation problems or illness within the family.

Although there have been difficulties, students, faculty and administrators have persevered and things should get better in the future because:

1) A lot of the necessary changes have been made;
2) There will be money available for counseling and supportive services through the Special Services for the Disadvantaged program;
3) There are now a number of PTE upperclassmen and graduates who will be able to provide strong peer support for those who will enter the program in the future.

### The Five Central Characters in Our Lady of the Lake's Community Involvement

Most accounts of organizational success revolve around the personalities and performances of the leaders involved. The story of The Lake cannot be understood without reference to five key figures in the administration and faculty. It was the two top-ranking sisters who were responsible for creating a climate at The Lake that made innovation possible, and for offering the crucial support at the many times Project Teacher Excellence encountered rough going.

Betty Carrow was The Lake's only vice-president and in charge of development, public relations and planning prior to her leaving the College and the sisterhood in the summer of 1969. Betty Carrow and Sister Mary Clare Metz, the academic dean, were the two sisters who provided The Lake's real leadership, both in faculty involvement and community projects. Betty Carrow was unusual in that she had a Ph.D. in speech therapy from Northwestern University, a non-Catholic institution. When she returned to The Lake from Northwestern, she organized the Harry Jersig Speech and Hearing Center which had its own board of directors. She built it into an important and successful center which now has a new building and a staff of 15 professionals. The speech and hearing clinic provides education and service to all elements of the San Antonio community, Catholic and non-Catholic alike.

Betty Carrow is a competent, attractive, progressive, friendly person who demonstrated that things could be done and got people moving. Her vistas were broadened both at Northwestern and when she and Sister Mary Clare Metz visited the other colleges together. Although she was not involved in starting Project Teacher Excellence, she was an important factor in The Lake's other areas of community involvement: the Model Cities Program, the Salute to Mexico Program, the proposed Creative Arts Center, and almost anything else that was new or innovative. She left The Lake and the sisterhood and returned to her native Houston to become a professor at the Baylor School of Medicine, partly because she was tired of the restrictions of the convent and partly because she desired a return to professional activities and partly because she felt that the constant conflicts between the forces of change and non-change were not resolvable within the existing structure. Although she won most of the battles she fought, what she remembers most is the tremendous amount of struggle that was involved in bringing about the changes.

One of the most hopeful signs at The Lake is how much Betty Carrow is missed. Sister Mary Clare Metz said:

> She was our greatest loss. She was loved, respected and admired by all, and one who was extremely difficult to replace.

President McMahon issued a statement which read:

> But of few people can it be said that their loss is an irreplaceable one, but in the case of Sister Mary Arthur (Betty Carrow's name in the order), in all sincerity, this is the simple truth.

There are many at the College who hope that Betty Carrow will succeed John McMahon as president of The Lake. At this point, Betty Carrow is concentrating on getting her personal life together and is uncertain about her future plans.

Some of the other sisters at The Lake may also leave the order. This is a dilemma facing all Catholic colleges. The Lake is handling the issue better than others. Those who leave the religious life are welcome to stay at the College and this has happened in the case of two of the faculty. There are a number of former priests at the college, one as a teacher and others as students.

Sister Mary Clare Metz, the academic dean, got her Ph.D. in biology from Catholic University, after graduating from the Lake. Her appearance, demeanor, and level of activity make it hard to believe that she is in her early sixties. Her grey hair and her habit, which is a dress, are stylish and her demeanor is forceful, but pleasant and optimistic at the same time. She is a diplomatic, realistic administrator who is strongly on the side of progress. She was able to be a strong force at The Lake because she was traditional enough to be accepted by the conservatives and because she is extremely reasonable. She and Betty Carrow were a forceful duo who were very different and yet respected each other and got things done.

President John McMahon is thought to have been a forceful and dynamic educator at the beginning of his long tenure, although at that time he had to share a lot of his power with the principal sister. Some claim that he has been slow to respond to innovation and unhappy with controversy. On the good side, he has supported new programs when adequate staff work has been done, he has enabled reform to take place easily and he has kept the college sound financially. There is a possibility that President McMahon may retire in the fairly near future for reasons of health.

Albert Griffith succeeded Betty Carrow as vice president. He had formerly been the head of the Department of English. He worked closely with Betty Carrow on a number of projects and this is apparently what made him aware of his potential for academic administration. He is a positive force who does most of the thinking about the future of the college and he is a likely choice to be the next president.

Guy Pryor is a professor of education and has been the father of the PTE program since its inception. He is a white Protestant, pushing sixty, who has been characterized as being "as liberal as a professional educator from Texas can be." He has been unswerving in his support for the PTE program and can talk endlessly about it in a most positive fashion. He has established really good communication and relations with the PTE students and he and they pride themselves on the proper Mexican pronunciation of their names. He is firm but warm and friendly with the students and fights for their causes when he thinks something needs to be corrected.

When the students were unhappy about the financial aid officer, they went to see President McMahon. McMahon dislikes controversy and confrontation and told Pryor, "I'm looking to you to keep the peace." Pryor responded:

> You can't expect me to keep from reporting injustice. If anything happens on this campus in the way of disorder, it will be the fault of the administration for not correcting injustices and not the fault of students who are protesting it.

Pryor knows that he and his program have enough acceptance on campus and that academic freedom is sufficiently respected that his outspokenness entails no risk on his part.

Pryor knows each of the PTE students and has no hesitancy about being firm with them.

> I'm not tough; I just tell them the facts of life. I can't be expected to battle to keep them out of academic trouble if they don't attend class. That's just telling them the facts of life.

The students are very positive about Pryor and aren't afraid to be outspoken in his presence about anything they don't like. He regards his greatest compliment as one of them saying: "Dr. Pryor, you're a real Mexican."

The Project Teacher Excellence Program

The program revolves around four components:

1. Bilingual education, which was the philosophical foundation upon which the program was founded and has resulted in an ideology which has shaped much of the students' attitudes and behavior.

2. The recruitment of Mexican-American students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds who would not normally have been qualified for admission to The Lake and who have a commitment to teaching.

3. Financial aid to make it possible for these students from low income backgrounds to attend The Lake and in many cases to live on campus.

4. Academic guidance and responsibility for the program centered in the office of Guy Pryor.

The Project Teacher Excellence Program has not resulted in a vastly revised curriculum. There have been efforts to start a Mexican-American Studies Program, but these have failed. There has not been an organized remedial or tutoring program nor has there been any special type of instruction. The College's recent grant under the Special Services to the Disadvantaged program should enable PTE to offer a different curriculum, especially for beginning students. However, poor high school preparation has caused many of the PTE students to have to work harder than their classmates and this has also resulted in a lot of extra work for faculty members.

1. Bilingual education. Project Teacher Excellence is based on the idea that Mexican-Americans would have a unique capacity to teach Mexican-American school children--especially in the early grades. Bilingual education might more properly be called bicultural education or education without denigration.

Bilingual education starts with the assumption that the child from a different background than the middle-class, white, Protestant child that predominates in the American public school is not as deprived as he is different. Public schools are and probably will continue to be run for the white middle-class majority, but a child from a different culture can be appreciated, made to feel comfortable and aided in making an adaption to a new culture. White middle-class teachers are very likely to make Mexican-American children feel that they are inferior and this coupled with their language difficulties makes many of them retire without even trying to compete.

Bilingual education is built around teachers who understand and appreciate Mexican-American culture. Mexican-American students entering public schools are not lacking communication skills, they merely lack the ability to communicate in the majority mode--white, middle-class English. The bilingual teacher starts by understanding and appreciating the culture of the student and by communicating with him, teaching him and letting him learn how to conceptualize in his own idiom. Once he has become socialized into school, learned some rudimentary skills, and developed a feeling of worth, he is helped with his English.

Because Mexican-American teachers understand and appreciate the culture of their pupils, and because they can communicate easily in Spanish (not the classical type but the variety spoken by Mexican-Americans in Texas), they have the greatest potential for reaching Mexican-American children. Furthermore, they are excellent role models. The Project

Teacher Excellence graduates offer young Mexican-American students the most visible proof that they too can make it.

At this point, a word is in order about Mexican-American culture, in the United States in general, and Texas in particular. Mexican-Americans in the southwest of the United States are the largest, most concentrated, deprived ethnic minority in the United States. They brought with them a well-developed culture which acquired its own unique style in the U.S. Two predominant factors of the culture are Catholicism and the family set-up, which is extended with shared goals and is warmer and more expressive than the standard American family.

Their Catholicism has made many of the PTE students more comfortable at The Lake than they would have been at a standard public institution, but at the same time they have been ready and willing to criticize the conservatism of the College and the required religion courses.

The strong emphasis on family is both an asset and a liability. The advantages are that Mexican-Americans feel a sense of worth and belonging and have many relatives upon whom they can count for support. The family is organized around the strong masculine image of the father, but that and other aspects of the closeness of the family cause problems. The student may feel that he is letting down his family by leaving it to attend college. He may feel a need to contribute a part of his financial aid to his family, or he may work long hours in the family store out of a sense of obligation when he should be studying. Mexican-Americans, and especially the girls, are taught to be submissive to authority because of their fathers. This has made the confrontation that has been necessary to make certain changes especially hard for the PTE students. They have stood up for their rights, but often with bowed heads and wishing that they hadn't had to.

There is one more aspect of Mexican-American culture that the just-beginning movement should help to overcome. With one another, Mexican-Americans are proud of their culture, but they tend to be ashamed of it in front of white Americans because they know it is looked down upon. One girl who grew up in a predominantly non-Mexican-American neighborhood described the reaction thus:

> We used to love tacos and eat them all the time. But if an anglo came to the door, the first thing mother would say would be 'Hide the tacos; it's an anglo.'

2. Recruitment into PTE. Recruitment has never been a problem since there have been many more potential candidates for the program than it could accommodate. The program was helped immensely by the fact that a large portion of the recruiting was paid for by the Talent Search Program, which although never intended to be a recruitment program for a single school, made the difference in hiring the right kind

of people who were able to reach the type of students for which the program was intended. Students were accepted on a very personal basis and the program aimed to get winners who might otherwise have gone to college but certainly wouldn't have gone to The Lake. The selection criteria were extremely explicit:

## Selection Criteria for Project Teacher Excellence

### Financial Need

Evidence of financial need necessitating extensive student aid in order to attend college. Definite preference is given to students in hard core poverty.

### Motivational Factors

1. Degree of concern for others
2. Credibility of observable and/or verbalized evidence of internalized realistic acceptance of the goal of becoming a bilingual teacher
3. Extent of ability to understand and to feel problems related to the "day-to-day" Mexican-American, who is both a victim and perpetuator of poverty
4. Evidence of desire to complete a four-year college teacher-training program. A factor here is what caused the applicant to show initial interest in the Project and the extent to which the original seed has grown to an impelling force.

### Personal Qualities

1. How has the applicant coped with his own problems?
2. Has he or she chosen assistance resources outside of himself; i.e., community agencies?
3. To what extent has the applicant been hurt or helped by problems?
4. Degree of independence, or lack of same, reflected in the work record
5. Degree of continuity reflected in work record

6. Nature of work involvement (e.g., work in community action programs tends to enhance awareness of social conditions

7. Experiences in a Mexican-American community in poverty

8. Personal experiences with a language problem in primary school

Academic Ability

1. Multiple sources for academic evaluation: College Entrance tests, Achievement Test record, IQ, high school record, honors, special achievements, and the degree of problems, difficulties, and adversities under which attainments were made.

2. Rank in class

3. Recommendations of teachers, counselors, principals, friends, social workers, interested citizens

4. Participation and success in extra-curricular activities

5. Evidences of ability discovered in the interview

6. Linguistic ability in Spanish and English

Other Factors

1. Evidence of emotional support by parents or other family members

2. Alertness and perceptiveness of the applicant as he is observed

Weighting of Selection Factors:

Financial Need is a prerequisite for selection.

Academic Ability, even though possibly below usual standards, must be evident sufficiently to indicate some possibility of success in college. Outstanding academic ability is neither sought nor discounted.

The Motivational Factors & Personal Qualities are plus factors that enable the applicant to emerge from among his competitors for selection.

The Admissions Office, which might have been expected to have been a barrier to the program, has not been because the administration decided that new admissions criteria would have to be set and that admissions decisions would be made by the PTE office and not by the Admissions Office.

3. Financial Aid. The three Office of Education financial aid programs have been the principal support of the PTE program. Many college and financial aid officers operate on the presumption that students should be given only a proportion of the money they need and encouraged to "scratch" for the rest. Early in the program, Guy Pryor determined that this wouldn't work. There was no place for these poor students to "scratch." Consequently, a decision was made to give the students full financial support, including a modest stipend for spending money.

Factors revolving about the former director of financial aid caused the most severe crisis in the project's history. According to the PTE staff, the sister who administered financial aid had an excellent mind for detail but caused the students immense problems by her method of dealing with them. Some students reported that she was a cold, distant and unpredictable person to work with. She would keep the students waiting a long time for appointments and then be short and curt with them. These students felt that she looked down on them and acted as if she was doling out charity.

Because the story is complex and controversial and because personalities are involved, we will quote a summary of the situation from an administrator who was close to the scene:

> The Sister who was financial aid officer was basically a good person who was steeped in the tradition of dispensing financial aid as charity. Her lack of cultural understanding, inconsistent and inequitable decisions, poor student relationships, and lack of vision for the potential of properly administered financial aid, caused her to be an impediment to the continuation of PTE. Her transfer to more suitable endeavors and the employment of a more flexible person with a broader concept of financial aid enabled the project to get back on even keel and expand. The low morale of the students disappeared. Her transfer was aided by some, resisted by some, and delayed by inaction. But the institution, after great travail, moved forward with a program of financial aid that gives an opportunity for poverty students to be successful in college.

Two interesting conclusions can be drawn from the problems caused by the original financial aid officer. The first is that the personality and method of operation of the person involved can be just as important as what the person does. People who have previously been looked down on are especially resentful of poor treatment. Secondly, the difficulty that the administration had in resolving the situation and the slowness with which it moved were indicative of the problems of institutions of higher education in dealing with urban and minority problems.

The original director of financial aid has been replaced by Cesar Trimble, an extremely competent Mexican-American from San Antonio who is quite popular and has made financial aid a positive force. For example, many of the College Work-Study jobs now send students out into the community where they get the opportunity both to do something for people and broaden their perspectives.

The importance of one negative component on a fledgling venture cannot be overstated. One year after the replacement of the original director of financial aid, both the PTE staff and students say that the largest problem the program has had involved the original administrator of financial aid.

4. Direction of the program and guidance. Guy Pryor's method of operation was described above. His intense concern with and interest in the students has been a major factor in their staying in the program and succeeding. Bob Rossa, Pryor's original assistant was also very close to the students. Many administrators feel that they can't get too close to people that they're trying to help and that personal involvement

can have negative consequences. The small staff of the PTE program and other key faculty and administrators have made a point of getting to know the students as people and of helping them to solve their personal problems, no matter how mundane or minute. This is especially important for students who wouldn't normally have come to college, who can't depend on their friends for support and advice. Now that the program has been going for several years, the older students have taken over much of the guidance that the PTE staff originally had to provide. The program also benefited by taking in upper classmen as transfer students, as well as freshmen, so that there was more maturity among the original PTE students.

One of the typical reactions of the PTE students is that of avoidance. Guy Pryor has found that when the students have problems, they frequently become ashamed and disturbed and stop attending classes. When they seem upset or they start cutting classes they are called in. One girl went to pieces because she was unable to complete a term paper on time. Guy Pryor called her in when he found out that she was cutting classes. He arranged for an extension on her paper and listened patiently while she told the tearful story of her problem. All she needed was someone to talk to and give her a little advice and help and then she managed well on her own.

The Students -- How the program has affected them and how they have affected the College.

Some might have thought that the Project Teacher Excellence students would have been looked down upon and given a hard time by the regular students. They might have been expected to be a disadvantaged minority who would have had to be protected from the regular students. Just the opposite has been the case. From the beginning, a strong esprit de corps emerged among the students. The PTE students are the largest organized faction on campus and by using modern organizing procedures, they now dominate the student government. They have protested about things and caused changes that the apathetic majority had been displeased with but hadn't known how to correct. Far from being looked down on, the PTE students are envied because of the special attention they get and the strong financial support they have received.

A recent article in The Phoenix, the college magazine, entitled "Frosh Rights Activist: Elvira Protests--But No One Joins" sums up the situation.

> OLL probably "boasts" one of the nation's lowest percentages of student radicals (the campus least likely to riot). Most of the slight number willing to call themselves liberal haven't yet made themselves conspicuous in campus affairs, consequently we often tend to rate our student body even more conservatively than we deserve.
>
> Believe it or not, OLL does have students who are "involved," where "involved" means marches, demonstrations, picketing--louder-then-words community action. Elvira Borrego, a freshman from Milwaukee, counts Resurrection City, NAACP Youth Council, marches for open housing, and the California grape boycott among her concerns.

Both in Milwaukee and here, Elvira has picketed and passed flyers advocating a nationwide boycott of California grapes. She sees little hope, however, despite all the efforts to support the migrant workers. Passing flyers on campus, she found the student reaction already one of disinterest--flyers were soon scattered on the floor. After experiencing so many negative reactions, as well as apathy, Elvira is perhaps justifiably bitter. "They might as well burn the Constitution--'people are created equal'--so who believes it?"

Since most of the action seems to be in Milwaukee and other cities in the North, why did Elvira come to San Antonio, to OLL? "PTE--this is the only college in the nation with a bilingual teacher education program like Project Teacher Excellence. If it weren't for PTE, I wouldn't stay here. The rest of the school just doesn't seem to be worth it."

As for community action in this locale, she sees nothing but potential. It's time the local members of "La Raza" took an interest in their own welfare, and united to get something done. The Southwest is where it's happening.

Elvira is dismayed with the general attitude of students here: "Too conservative, no one seems to care very much about anything. There's little unity on campus except among PTE students."...

The program has really been willing to take chances on various types of people and to show real concern for all the people that have been admitted. One of the most impressive students admitted is a girl named Adelpha Galvan who has poor hearing, poor eyesight, a speech defect and just barely made it out of high school. She was told by her high school counselor not to apply to college and by people at the University of Texas not to apply. She had low scores on tests but anyone who would talk to her would readily discover her high motivation. She had read an encyclopedia to teach herself. She very much wanted to go to college. She actually thought she was too dumb.

After graduating from high school, she took a civil service job but heard of the program through her friends in the Mexican-American community.

Adelpha came for a personal interview and was accepted because of her motivation. The Lake has provided her with speech therapy and a hearing aid. On top of all her other problems, she was run into by a truck during a rest period while on a student march to raise funds for tuberculosis and was hospitalized with a broken pelvis. The College has made arrangements to have all her classes meet in one classroom with a bed in it so that she can keep up with her course work. Adelpha Galvan will probably do very well at The Lake and become an outstanding teacher.

Not all of the high risk entrants will work out as well. Almost everyone in the program is concerned about the problematic future of a 31-year-old divorced woman who only completed seventh grade in regular school. She has had a great deal of trouble and faculty members have spent a lot of time working with her on a one-to-one basis.

The principal advantage of a small college is that people are known to the faculty and administrators and can receive individual solutions to their problems. Bruce Curry, a black senior transfer student from Louisiana's Dillard College, was attracted by The Lake's alleged liberality and its interest in attracting male undergraduates to what had previously been an all-girl school. He is very bright and outspoken and is well accepted by the faculty, despite the fact that he sprinkles his conversations with four-letter words: "Just to let them know where I'm at." Bruce says of the College:

> Lake is good if you don't fit the standard. However, I came here expecting liberality and I found brick walls when I said that change was needed.

Bruce is pleased that he came and feels that he personally has been responsible for causing some change, especially in the attitudes of those who've come to know him.

The two new minorities on campus, the PTE students and the men alike, both complain about the conservatism and the slowness with which change occurs. For example, although the College now is co-educational, the men feel the physical education program is too limited.

Alberto Cortez grew up in the neighborhood adjacent to The Lake and has done very well academically. As a child he used to be embarrassed by the charity tone of everything the sisters did for the community--specifically for his own family. He remembers one Thanksgiving when a basket of food was brought to his house and how humiliated he felt and how he was scolded by his parents for not being appreciative. Alberto wants to be an educational reformer and not just a regular teacher in the Mexican-American community. He is troubled about his promise to the program to remain in the region and teach.

Certainly the program will be a success if it produces one or two real educational reformers of the type that Alberto Cortez shows promise of being. On the other hand, however, there is a problem in asking high school students to make a commitment to an occupation. The majority of the PTE graduates will probably become bilingual teachers. The program has made a real effort to locate those who sincerely want to become teachers; however, young people can change their minds.

There has been a real clash of cultures between the PTE girls and the other Lake students. Most of the previous students, both anglos and Mexican-American girls alike, were middle-class ladies. The PTE girls were more boisterous, less restrained, much more willing to be critical of the College. The first day that one of the girls wore a mini-skirt, three different sisters told her that her appearance wasn't appropriate at Our Lady of the Lake. Another girl was criticized for dating too many different boys.

The PTE students were the first to voice strong objection to some of the courses. Carmen Prieto, one of the first graduates of the program said:

> We were all peeved with the Social Theory course. We all had to suffer and we all got C's. The Community course was a complete waste of time. The teacher said something about theory but she didn't know anything at all about San Antonio.

Carmen was annoyed that the brunt of bringing about change had fallen to the PTE students.

> Before us, the good ladies just played the game. We were the only ones who spoke out.

There have been many changes made in a variety of courses since the Project Teacher Excellence girls started to complain. One course that has been completely revamped has been the Ethnic Relations course. A new professor brought in outside speakers and movies and the students felt that the course improved markedly .

Changes came about because PTE students complained and the faculty and staff responded. The PTE staff was the crucial link in the chain. Guy Pryor listened to the complaints and carried them to faculty and administration. Carmen Prieto says that she wasn't afraid of complaining because she knew that Guy Pryor carried enough weight to keep her from being kicked out of the College. The students still have a lot of complaints about specific courses and about the slowness with which change can be effected.

One of the people who has been most affected by the PTE program is Sister James Elizabeth. She is a Mexican-American. She was born and brought up in the neighborhood around The Lake. Many of the students say that she used to be snobbish about the PTE students, but that she has changed. She is now very positive about the PTE students and about her own background. She knows all the students and counsels them personally.

### Other efforts of The Lake to involve itself with the Mexican-American community

The Lake has become involved in the Mexican-American community in a number of other ways since the start of Project Teacher Excellence. Former Vice-President Betty Carrow was involved in starting most of these other involvements, but none of them has been as effective in producing change as PTE. However, all of these other efforts, when taken in conjunction with PTE, mean that The Lake now has a substantial across-the-board involvement with the Mexican-American community.

The Model Cities Program

With the assistance of Betty Carrow, the office for the Model Cities program in the area near the College was located in College quarters. According to Henry Cisnero, the assistant director of San Antonio Model Cities, the College was extremely cooperative in providing space for staff, parking, and meeting rooms. Substantively, The Lake became involved on the education and housing committees and the School of Social Work was involved in a number of projects. Such involvement is no guarantee that the college will earn good marks from the community. Cisnero was frustrated by The Lake's conservatism. He reflected:

> The Lake is an ivory tower in a state of turmoil over conflicting concepts of its being a finishing school and its being an involved place. Project Teacher Excellence is tearing up the place. Before Project Teacher Excellence, the student body, including the Mexican-Americans, were nice, Catholic, mother-protected girls. The College is at least ten years behind in doing something for the education of Mexican-Americans...I'm afraid that it may go back to being a conservative institution after flirting with involvement.

Creative Arts of San Antonio (CASA)

Again, under the influence of Betty Carrow, a $50,000 planning grant was obtained from the Special Opportunity Planning Section of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. CASA will be an integral part of the Model Cities program. The arts center will tie together the teaching ability of the strong Art Department at The Lake, the art students at the College, and the need and desire of the people in the community to encourage Mexican-American art.

CASA hopes to use art as a means of allowing the local residents to discover Mexican-American culture.

> Though the CASA program will begin small with temporary make-shift facilities, a largely volunteer staff, and financial support from Our Lady of the Lake College, plans call eventually for a comprehensive program of innovative arts education for all age groups and the finest and most imaginative facilities available anywhere...
>
> The first facility for CASA's beginning programs will be a small frame house at the Commerce Street entrance to Our Lady of the Lake's campus. Proposals have also been submitted to Model Cities for space in the multi-service centers to be erected next year in West End Park and Cassiano Park.
>
> Three programs have already been started--two in arts instruction and one in arts research..They include a creative dramatics program for second and third graders at Las Palmas Elementary School, conducted by Lake drama instructor Camilla Ritchey; a movie-making project for high school students, directed by local film-maker Severo Perez; and a research study on Mexican-American culture in the Southwest by San Antonio historian Richard Santos. Other projects soon to be started will include experimental programs of instruction in folk-dancing, ballet, photography, arts and crafts, and guitar.
>
> All activities of CASA will be designed both to reach Model Cities residents directly through arts instruction programs and to provide demonstration and research models of the latest in arts education methodology for teachers and student-teachers to carry over into schools and other educational programs throughout the city. CASA will serve students, teachers and adults.

## Mexican-American Studies

It was somewhat surprising that the PTE students have not made a major push for the start of a Mexican-American studies program. Actually, former Vice-President Carrow had anticipated the need for such a program and located a high-level Mexican-American who would have developed a program of Mexican-American studies. She got a foundation to agree to pay half his salary for one year, but couldn't get the other half. Unfortunately innovation costs money and funds are frequently available for starting, but not continuing programs. This definitely restricts private colleges.

### Salute to Mexico

The Salute to Mexico program began in the spring of 1968 and has been held each year since then. It has presented ballet, concerts and art shows. It's been a high caliber program complete with full color brochures and the most professional talent. Salute to Mexico has been a joint endeavor between the College and the cultural arm of the State Department of Mexico. The aim has been to show San Antonians that Mexico has a highly developed culture. While the program has been generally regarded as successful, there had been a problem of cooperation on the program between the College and the Mexican-American community of San Antonio, but this has since improved.

### The Worden School of Social Service

Although the School of Social Service has turned out Mexican-American social workers, set up community centers in the barrios for placement, served agencies dealing with Mexican-Americans, and done research on hunger and other problems of the Mexican-American community, it has still lagged behind what it could have done. Louis Tomano, the associate director of the school, says:

> Project Teacher Excellence has made us ask the question, "Why don't we do the same?" So we're trying.

There had been only one Mexican-American faculty member up until 1970 and now another is being hired. However, the school does have twelve part-time Mexican-American faculty who are "field instructors." The Lake is one of four institutions having schools of social work that are sharing in a five-year National Institute of Mental Health grant to recruit Mexican-American faculty members, students, and to revise the curriculum. Eventually the School of Social Work aims to have Mexican-American students constitute twenty percent of its enrollment. A study completed in 1969 by the National Council on Social Work showed that 12 of the 21 Mexican-Americans holding M.S.W.'s had been educated at Worden.

The School of Social Service is also involved in a delinquency prevention project which is the only direct outgrowth of The Lake's involvement with the Model Cities program.

### The Future of PTE and The Lake

Project Teacher Excellence will probably continue to thrive and to increase in size, although it will always have a bit of an uphill battle due to conservative elements at the College. The crucial elements in its success were the dedicated and sensitive staff and faculty who helped to get it started and the tremendous ability and determination of the students themselves.

A major problem that faces The Lake is the uncertainty about higher education in San Antonio once the University of Texas opens its projected branch there. This uncertainty, plus the fact that the president and the academic dean will be retiring before long, makes it difficult for many of the other administrators and faculty at The Lake to plan for the future. The Lake faces the same kinds of problems that many other Catholic, formerly predominantly women's colleges, face. Some of the most talented sisters may leave the order and recruitment into the convent is declining. The Lake would like to attract more men and has engaged in a fairly imaginative effort to reach returning veterans. By the fall of 1970, males accounted for a reasonably large 21 percent of the enrollment.

The Catholic colleges in San Antonio have joined together in a consortium to strengthen themselves for the forthcoming joust with the University of Texas. The Lake has been a leading force in this consortium. Students will be allowed to take courses at the other colleges and all graduate education will be centralized. President McMahon has been advocating a tuition equalization bill which would be a big step in helping the San Antonio colleges to cooperate rather than compete.

The key to The Lake's success in the future will be its ability to attract and retain high calibre leadership and its ability to form meaningful ties with the Mexican-American community. Innovative administrators will probably still find The Lake a frustrating place at which to work. Betty Carrow left because she felt that everything was just too much of a fight. Until people like her feel that such a college can be an exciting place which invites innovation, the potential of such small, special colleges will never be realized. However, the Lake has done a host of exciting things, things, has gained confidence now in its ability to experiment and has left most parochial religious colleges far behind.

* * *

## SELECTED REFERENCES

Project Teacher Excellence Annual Progress Report, 1967-1968

Report on Development (Our Lady of the Lake), The Vice President of Development and Public Relations, June 1969

"Arts Center: A Place for People," Our Lady of the Lake College Magazine, Spring-Summer 1970, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 19-21

"What does Urban America have to do with that small Catholic Liberal Arts College called 'Our Lady of the Lake'?" Our Lady of the Lake College Magazine, Vol. 1, No. 3, November 1968

Brussell, Charles B., Disadvantaged Mexican American Children and Early Educational Experience, Austin, Texax: Southwest Educational Development Corporation, 1968, 105 pp.

# SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY:
# GROWTH THROUGH SERVICE

George Nash

# SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY: GROWTH THROUGH SERVICE

Friends and foes alike agree that Delyte Morris, the President of Southern Illinois University (SIU) and presider over its meteoric growth from obscurity, is a dynamic leader. The fact that he has asked to become President Emeritus at the age of 62, and probably will be giving up active stewardship of SIU after 21 years, makes this a particularly appropriate time to attempt to recount how SIU has served the once-impoverished Southern Illinois region. Its success in convincing citizens and state legislators that it has been of service has made its growth possible.

There has been no question that it has provided service as an educator. When Morris arrived in the fall of 1948 there were 3,300 students on a one-square-block campus in Carbondale, 100 miles to the southeast of St. Louis, Missouri. In the academic year 1969-1970 there were 23,000 students at SIU's Carbondale campus and another 12,000 at the new Edwardsville campus 20 miles to the east of St. Louis. Graduate enrollment has increased twenty times from 250 students to 5,000. For years SIU had a virtual open admissions policy and thus many of those students from Southern Illinois who attended would probably not have gone to college elsewhere.

This chapter will concentrate on SIU's explicit attempts to aid the development and renewal of (1) extreme Southern Illinois, the region surrounding its Carbondale campus, and (2) the region east of St. Louis, Missouri.

In the area surrounding Carbondale the University achieved a great deal of success by pioneering in imaginative community-building in the small, impoverished towns that dot the region. However, the Community Development Services Unit which was once a community developer has become much more academic over the years and now emphasizes instruction and research.

When Community Development Services attempted to revitalize an urban area with a sizeable black population--East St. Louis, Illinois--it failed. We shall explore whether this was due to lack of commitment on the part of the University, inapplicability of the methods which had proven successful in the south, or the basic unsalvageability of the city. Although its efforts in East St. Louis have not been successful, SIU is now working to develop the metropolitan area east of St. Louis, Missouri. Here its chances of success appear brighter.

In addition to serving as educator of the region's youth, Southern Illinois University has been of service to the region by being a major employer and purchaser of goods and services. Edwardsville and Carbondale are the two largest economic concentrations in Southern Illinois. Their total revenues approach $100 million per year. President Morris stressed the bricks and mortar approach to expansion and the worth of the physical plant rose from $5 million in 1948 to a present value of $200 million with another $100 million in construction under way or being planned.

SIU may not be a powerhouse academically but it is fairly impressive. More than half of the 3,500 faculty members hold the doctorate and they attract approximately $10 million worth of research grants each year. More than half a dozen interdisciplinary centers and institutes geared to broad concerns such as labor and Latin American affairs have been created on a permanent basis. There is a sizeable concentration of foreign students and a number of relationships with institutions in other countries. The University has gone out of its way to attract big names to the faculty, such as Harvard astronomer Howard Shapeley, and architectural and social visionary R. Buckminister Fuller.

Even his detractors admit that Delyte Morris is the principal reason that SIU is a large, major institution today. His critics charge that he is an empire builder and that faculty and students have not shared sufficiently in decision making. Many feel that a person of his decisiveness and drive was necessary to bring the institution to its present level, but that different methods are needed now.

The three areas that Southern Illinois University has attempted to serve are quite different:

1. Extreme Southern Illinois is the area contained between the Mississippi and the Ohio Rivers. It has no sizeable cities. Since the coal mines gave out in the 1930's, the region has been economically depressed. The economy of some of the towns has incraased in recent years and this has been due in part to the work of Community Development Services.
2. East St. Louis, Illinois has long been the poor cousin lying directly across the river from St. Louis, Missouri. It has been heavily industrial and poor. In recent years it has become increasingly black in population (going from

40 percent in 1960 to approximately two-thirds in 1970). The population has declined from 85,000 to approximately 70,000. It is regarded as a troubled city.

3. The metropolitan area east of St. Louis is now referred to as Metro East. This region contains the only sizeable cities in the southern half of Illinois. In addition to East St. Louis, there are Belleville, Granite City and Alton. Edwardsville lies roughly in the center of this region which is now readily accessible to St. Louis, Missouri because of recent Interstate Highway construction. This region is much richer than the one surrounding Carbondale, but has generally been underdeveloped.

1. Community Development in Southern Illinois

At the time Delyte Morris, a native of Southern Illinois, took over the presidency of SIU in the fall of 1948, there was already a businessmen's organization, Southern Illinois, Inc., which was interested in promoting education and the general development of the region. William Leylerle, a local businessman who was active in the organization, became friendly with Morris and pointed out the need for developing SIU as a sort of industry.

It was during this period that Morris learned of Baker Brownell, who was a philosopher primarily interested in the small community as a basis of democratic life. Brownell, who was shortly to retire from Northwestern University, was invited to Carbondale by Morris. Out of this meeting, Brownell agreed to come to the campus and it was under his leadership that the Area Services Plan of Southern Illinois University was implemented and developed with Brownell serving as the first director.

At the suggestion of Brownell, the University hired Richard Poston, who was in charge of the Community Development Program at the University of Washington and Poston was named director of the Community Development Service which became a unit of the Area Services. With Poston's arrival in 1953, the University became a major force in the renewal of communities in Southern Illinois.

As Poston saw it, one of the principal deficits of Southern Illinois was a feeling of hopelessness on the part of its residents. Furthermore, there were two competing groups of miners and there was a history of bitter labor-management strife. A major national factory locating service had just dealt the region a major blow by recommending against locating new factories in the area because of labor unrest.

Poston wanted to start his program in Southern Illinois with a quick visible success in one town which would then provide him with access to others. Before he even arrived from Washington, publicity was disseminated about what SIU was hoping to do in community development. A labor group in Eldorado, Illinois, a small town of 4,000 people, asked the University for help in September, 1953.

Poston's first response was to get the community to make an investment and to begin to work together. The organization that had contacted the University was asked to assemble a representative group of town residents for a meeting at the University to discuss what might be done. Poston told them that the two newspapers which didn't get along would have to work together and that labor and management would have to bury their differences and cooperate. The project was to be a self-help effort with the University providing leadership and staff, but not funds.

Citizen response was enthusiastic from the start.

Drama and public relations were used to involve the citizenry in community self-analysis and local problem solving. The first step was a gala outdoor rally in October, attended by a number of politicians and University officials. The principal speaker was Richard Poston who stood in his shirtsleeves and gave an inspiring 45-minute talk painting the future that could be if only the people would work together.

Not surprisingly, the first step was a study. However, the purpose of the research was primarily to get the people involved in planning the future of their own town and only secondarily to uncover knowledge. The data for the study was to come from a census of all residents of the town. Since the purpose was to get as many citizens involved as possible, 300 people were enrolled as census takers. The week of training they received was their first experience in community development and working together.

The census was kicked off with a bang. The census takers gathered together at a pancake breakfast. Handbills had already been distributed to every household announcing the census, which had also been described at length in the newspapers. Church bells and fire sirens heralded the beginning of the census and an airplane circled overhead dropping smoke bombs.

Two weeks later, 1,000 people gathered to discuss the preliminary results of the census. Those attending the meeting were broken up into 15 working committees to study specific issues, such as beautification, the library, and industrial development. Group discussion leaders and note takers each received special training. Town meetings were held over the next few months to hear the recommendations from the study groups. These were mass meetings with as many as 2,000 people attending.

This was research with a different twist. Instead of research being done by the experts to forestall or to delay action, the research was done by the citizens as a first step in their becoming aware of the possible solutions to their problems. Correctness of methodology, exactness of findings, and publications in journals were not the goals. Rather, the aim was to let the people determine what their problems were so that they could begin to formulate their own solutions.

One of the first and most popular activities that Community Development Services engaged in in Eldorado was beautification. The city hall was remodeled with volunteer labor. Once they learned how to do it and saw their neighbors were doing it, people began to spruce up their neighborhoods and their houses.

From the outset it was clear that the principal interest of the citizens was in attracting industry and improving the economic condition of the town. Community Development Services helped organize six small local industries and got two manufacturers to set up operations in town. Poston worked personally with each of the manufacturers to help solve their problems.

By the spring of 1954 Eldorado was the visible success that Richard Poston had hoped for. Area newspapers gave the town's story a great deal of attention. Eldorado won the top civic award of the American Freedoms Foundation and was named an All-American City by Look Magazine.

Edward R. Murrow featured Eldorado in a one-hour "See It Now" television documentary. The residents had planned to convert a four-acre run-down area into a park. To make the television show more dramatic and to show what a community can do when it sets its mind to it, the park was built in one day. Starting at dawn, 385 truckloads of dirt were brought in and bulldozed into place. By the time dusk fell the park was being seeded.

Success in Eldorado led to a host of requests from other communities and Community Development Services began a large-scale operation that continued for the next six years. By 1960 there had been full programs in more than 20 communities. The budget of Community Development Services went from $24,000 per year to $250,000 and by 1960 there was a staff of 17 at work.

Poston realized that economic development was essential for community development. It usually wasn't possible to improve community services without improving the economy of the city. An industrial development specialist, Robert Henderson, was appointed to the staff despite the fact that he had not attended college. He and Poston secured funds from the local utility companies for entertaining visiting industrialists and to pay for exhibit space at industrial fairs. They worked with Chicago Bankers to make credit available in Southern Illinois and they persuaded the industrial rating firms to recommend Southern Illinois as an industrial site. In six years industries with annual payrolls in excess of $60 million moved into the area. Community Development Services also helped start home-grown industry such as a tomato growers' cooperative.

In his years in Southern Illinois, Poston developed and promulgated a philosophy which is best summarized by the title of his book, Democracy is You. The primary need was to help the citizens organize themselves to build a community which would encompass all civic interest groups but which would rise above individual interests. Poston's statements were evangelistic and optimistic, but they recognized that professionals and technicians make the largest contribution to community renewal when the citizens themselves assume responsibility and direction.

> "One of the great difficulties that we have fallen into in America is that in our civic efforts we have tended to treat something which is basically whole, namely the community, as though it were an assortment of parts and pieces that have no relationship to each other... We have an assortment of many worthwhile goals, but all pulling separately instead of pulling together, and in most cases without so much as knowing what each other is doing... The development of a healthy and prosperous community cannot be accomplished by isolating out from the total context of community life any one part of that life and attempting to deal with that part as though it were an arm, or a head, or a kidney, unrelated to the total community body, any more than a doctor can properly treat a man without considering the whole man...
>
> We have failed to recognize as we should that in a democracy it is the ability and willingness of the people to do things for themselves, to work out their own destiny through the exercise of informed, creative citizenship that gives the people their greatest power for the achievement of worthwhile community goals.
>
> In our over-emphasis on specialization and professionalism in an age of technology, this quality of creative citizenship, by which a community is able to solve its problems for itself, has tended to give way to a worship of the expert almost to the point where we no longer have confidence in our own ability to do anything about improving our communities for ourselves. Thus, in our community affairs, we have tended to become a nation of spectators... We must realize that although there is a place for the expert and the technically trained staff, in the final analysis the people of the community will have to do the job for themselves."

To aid the communities being renewed, Poston and his staff developed how-to-do-it manuals with sections on beautification, recreation, housing, culture, and social welfare. Lists of resources, both regional and national, were included. Typical of data offered was the information on housing. The manual suggested that neighbors swap time with each other to perform difficult tasks, that local merchants be urged to sponsor housing clinics, that neighborhood improvement contests be carried out, and that campaigns such as paint-up and clean-up campaigns be mounted. The manual also offered advice on zoning, building regulations and home improvement loans and listed the appropriate public officals that were responsible for maintaining housing standards.

The idea was always to organize as many groups as possible into a cooperative effort and to involve as many citizens as possible. When the town was larger, people were to be organized on a neighborhood basis. An account written by one of Poston's staff about the organization of one urban neighborhood is a case in point. A woman called city hall to complain that a junk yard was being planned for the vacant lot next to her house. She had intended to register a complaint and nothing more.

She was referred to George Criminger, a consultant from Community Development Services, who told her that if she would arrange a meeting of neighbors to discuss the matter, he would join them. By the following evening she had gathered together a group of neighbors, most of whom had never done anything together before. Criminger used the concern with the junkyard as a means of getting the community to organize itself. It took a number of meetings and a lot of effort but eventually a viable community organization was formed. The residents were successful in keeping the junkyard out. Among the first tasks were defining the boundaries of the community and finding out what the residents wanted. Representatives of this neighborhood group then became a part of the city-wide coalition of groups.

At the same time Community Development Services was achieving its success in renewing towns and cities in Southern Illinois, it was being transformed by academic pressures. According to Poston, staffing always presented a problem. People with the proper academic credentials were less willing and able to do community organizing. The academicians preferred research and teaching.

Academic background was not a problem to Richard Poston. He had not pursued either the standard graduate training nor had he climbed the traditional academic ladder from assistant to full professor with progress rewarded by publications. He was a sociologist interested in effecting change. To reward his success, Delyte Morris promoted Poston to a full research professorship in 1960. Research professorships at SIU are academic rewards with their holders having virtually no fixed responsibilities and the ability to do what they see fit. Since 1960, Poston has studied and engaged in community development and urban sociology in many parts of the world, but he has had little contact with Community Development Services and Southern Illinois.

Under different and more traditionally academic leadership, the mission of Community Development Services has led to a heavier emphasis on instruction. The research is now more traditional, with most of it being done by experts. It has become outstanding in both fields, but the beneficiaries have been primarily the students, many of whom are former Peace Corps Volunteers, and the faculty. The number of students enrolled has increased from just two in 1966, to 66 in 1970. Comprehensive community-wide development is no longer the emphasis.

The present director, Richard Thomas, feels that many of the former functions of Community Development Services have been taken over by various programs of the federal government. To help communities, Community Development Services now stresses research. Presently, it is developing a program of aerial photography of the region so that benchmark data on the state of the region can be determined. Some of the staff, usually holdovers from the 1950's, are engaged in action programs. Boyd Butler was instrumental in starting a parent-child center which Community Development Services also evaluated. Present projects are primarily individual efforts which will aid both communities and the region, but will not completely revitalize individual communities.

In 1968, a very different sort of service was started within Community Development Service at Carbondale that, because it was a new and unique approach, did cause some internal conflict in its early stages of development. The Vice President of the Area and International Services, Ralph W. Ruffner, brought in Walter Robinson, a black man, who had previously served as director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps in East St. Louis, to head University Services to Carbondale.

Robinson defined the task of his office as determining how the University could best serve the disadvantaged persons and communities of Southern Illinois, with priority in the black communities.

Here emphasis was not on teaching or research. The area of internal conflict resulted when Robinson bypassed Community Development Service and reported directly to the Vice President. Because of the urgency of the needs of the disadvantaged and also because of the problems both on campus and off he felt justified in his actions.

Robinson was active in helping the black university students in Carbondale to organize the Black American Studies program. He helped the students start a newspaper which also served the black community of Carbondale. In Cairo, Illinois, he worked with blacks to organize a cooperative supermarket. His office acted as a broker matching the needs of the black community for specific types of education, technical assistance and recreation with the resources and competencies of the University.

Now, University Services to Carbondale and Community Development Services are working together to aid the black community in Cairo. One of the University's principal contributions to Carbondale has been assistance in its successful application to become a Model City.

University Services to Carbondale was very different than either the old or the new Community Development Services. Walter Robinson did not attempt to organize communities, rather he found out what the community wanted and then tried to mobilize University resources to help secure those ends. Perhaps one reason that Community Development Services had not done as much with blacks was that Community Development only worked with communities that requested its services and the overwhelming majority of counties in Southern Illinois are white. Hence, naturally most requests were from white communities. After he got University Services to Carbondale operating as a unit serving the black community, Walter Robinson was made a high-ranking troubleshooter and Jerry Lacey, also black, was brought in to replace him.

Despite the fact that SIU Carbondale has the second largest population of black students of any major university (the first being Wayne State), there are relatively few blacks on the faculty and black students felt that they had a host of problems both on and off the campus. Now SIU Carbondale has the beginnings of a good black studies program, an impressive black students' center, and a program to recruit and train black faculty. SIU is serving this southern region in which it is located by attempting to be an example in the area of black and white relations.

SIU has served another important educational need in Southern Illinois. In 1953, it opened the Vocational and Technical Institute which provides the equivalent of a technical junior college curriculum leading to an associate's degree and adult non-credit extension courses. The Institute is the largest school of its type in Southern Illinois with 1,500 students enrolled in 28 fields. It offers a wide range of technical courses such as architectural, automotive, and aviation technology, and mortuary science and commercial art. The Vocational and Technical Institute has also operated programs for poor blacks in East St. Louis and programs in prisons.

The combination of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale and the Vocational and Technical Institute located ten miles away offer a broad range of education at low cost to an area that once was virtually bereft of institutions of higher education. One reason that each was able to expand so rapidly was that almost any high school graduate could attend. This has lead to an increased demand for education so that each of the institutions is now forced to be more selective. However, SIU and the Vocational and Technical Institute each allow students who rank low in their high school graduating classes to enroll in the spring semester, while restricting enrollment for the fall semester to those who ranked higher.

SIU operates a number of programs which "attempt to improve the quality of human life." It is now planning to consolidate these efforts in a College for Human Resources Development. The new unit would be pragmatic and revolve around service and systems change rather than standard academic instruction. It would include not only Community Development Services, but also the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, the black studies program and units in social work and organizational analysis. The faculty would be predominantly problem oriented scholars. In such a college it may be more possible for the reward structure to revolve around results rather than publications.

One reason that SIU was able to proceed so imaginatively in the area of community development in Southern Illinois was Delyte Morris' willingness to innovate. In the case of Richard Poston and his early associates in Community Development Services, the ability to produce was more important than academic credentials. Innovation can also result in failure or controversy however. SIU operated a Job Corps Center in Breckenridge, Kentucky which was not regarded as successful. Operation of the camp was switched from SIU to a private corporation. University officials engaged in the Job Corps Center project feel that they learned something from the program, even though the University itself suffered.

## II. Southern Illinois University in East St. Louis.

Southern Illinois University's record in East St. Louis has been far less successful than was the record of Community Development Services in the southernmost region of Illinois. Two events occurred virtually simultaneously which affected the future of East St. Louis:

Community Development Services was invited in to help East St. Louis renew itself in 1956. This effort was ended in 1965 with mixed success.

The University began an extension center in East St. Louis in 1954 and bought out a defunct college in Alton in 1957. Harold W. See, the head of the first extension effort, worked with local businessmen to organize community support for the establishment of a college in the area and to help raise funds. The University settled on Edwardsville instead of East St. Louis for the site of its new campus. The campus became a reality when Delyte Morris persuaded the state legislature to earmark $25 million of a $195 million bond issue (which had been passed for statewide college and university building) for the construction of the Edwardsville campus in 1960. ($28 million from the same funds were set aside for the Carbondale campus.) See left the University in a controversy over his trying to have the new campus operated as a separate entity, independent of SIU. Although SIU had at one time operated a fairly substantial educational program in East St. Louis, it has now moved most of its facilities to the Edwardsville campus.

Community Development Services in East St. Louis

With the aid of consultants from Community Development Services a city-wide organization named Community Progress Incorporated was started in East St. Louis in 1957. There was a 21-member board of directors and most community organizations were represented. A series of fact-finding committees were set up in areas such as education, recreation, and government. Attempts were made to organize local neighborhoods and to get the heads of these neighborhood organizations together. Progress was slow and the results disappointing. The first town meeting was not held until November 1959 and it and other community-wide meetings were not regarded as successful. Lack of success was partially attributed to racial tensions and partly due to the fact that local issues were seen as more important than community-wide issues. For a variety of reasons, no strong organization having widespread community support emerged. This meant that all the subsequent programs that the University and the federal government poured into East St. Louis were individual, unrelated efforts which did not build upon one another.

There were two further reasons why the efforts to form a strong community in East St. Louis failed:

1. Because of the complexity of problems in East St. Louis, the job was more difficult than originally envisioned. Community Development Services operated a vigorous program for three years--the period that Richard Poston originally felt was necessary. However, much more help was still needed. When the mission of Community Development Services changed after Poston left in 1960, the program became less aggressive and more academic. Lila Teer, who was involved in the initial efforts

to organize East St. Louis in 1957 and is now SIU's coordinator of programs in East St. Louis, believes that progress was being made and that if the same vigor had been pursued for the next several years there would have been much more to show for the entire effort.

2. The white power structure pinned a lot of its hopes on the presence of SIU in East St. Louis. When Edwardsville opened in 1965 and most units of SIU were pulled out of East St. Louis, some of the white power structure that had remained left the city. Had SIU built its campus in East St. Louis, the East St. Louis story might have ended very differently. However, there wasn't enough room in East St. Louis for the massive type of campus that SIU wanted.

Gene Graves, an assistant to President Morris, and the former director of Business and Economic Development for the State of Illinois, who was one of the original Community Development Service consultants in East St. Louis, feels that the University failed in East St. Louis for another reason. The University failed to become involved with political problems in a partisan sense. He feels that the University had many opportunities for direct action which it did not take. A study was done by the University which showed how bad the housing situation was, but then the University did not go to the next step and get involved in the building of housing. Graves feels that there is a real anti-SIU backlash in East St. Louis now. "The University should have avoided inflicting on the community associate professors with all the answers. SIU has been a crutch in East St. Louis. It should have been a catalyst."

Despite the fact the Southern Illinois University was unable to bring about the birth of an enduring community organization, many of those people who were active in Community Progress, Inc. are now involved in the East St. Louis Model Cities Program. A large proportion of the leadership that does exist today in the Model Cities Program got its first taste of action in the early community work of Southern Illinois University.

The Edwardsville campus has never gotten involved in community development in the same way as was done in Carbondale. There is a Regional and Urban Development unit, but its major aims are providing data and doing evaluations. Much of its research has been focused on East St. Louis, Illinois. Staff from the unit were loaned to the city to assist the city in being designated a Model City. It has continued to assist the Model City Program.

In its last years in East St. Louis, SIU began a number of special educational program which may lift the productivity of the area and help to generate new black leadership.

Katherine Dunham, a distinguished black dancer, has set up the Performing Arts Training Center and Dynamic Museum which serves to train teachers in the performing arts, as a recreation and training center for young black children, and as a museum and library for black art and culture. It is funded in part by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Danforth and Rockefeller Foundations. It has been quite successful.

The University also set up the Experiment in Higher Education which was funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and was one of the first challenging, open-enrollment college programs for black urban students with poor academic backgrounds. The Experiment in Higher Education accepted all high school graduates and most were poorly prepared.

It was a success based on the performance of students there and at colleges to which they transferred for their last two years. The backbone of the program was a dedicated faculty recruited from around the country on the basis of their willingness to teach, work hard and relate to ghetto kids, and not on the basis of credentials. Many had only B.A.'s. The program had tremendous symbolic effect on colleges throughout the country as it demonstrated that poorly prepared students with the proper program and personnel could be turned on and enabled to make it academically.

The program was anti-remedial. "Remedial programs lower kids' aspirations," said Ed Crosby, the bearded black associate director of the program with a doctorate in German. "We want to challenge students and to raise their aspirations. If a student has trouble with reading we give him Candy (the racy best seller) and a dictionary, not a remedial text. A black student who has survived twenty years in the ghetto has a tremendous amount of savy and ability, otherwise he'd be dead. He has to learn new ways of doing things and new values. We try to make our students realize that education is a good hustle."

The program, which was funded for 200 students, was successful because SIU was willing to really experiment with new forms and philosophies and because it wasn't hung up on credentials. Hower, like much radical innovation, it didn't endure at the same level on which it began. The original faculty was recruited away to start similar programs at other institutions. The distance from the Edwardsville campus, the coming of a new community college and the withdrawal by SIU from East St Louis all worked against it. The program demonstrated SIU's willingness and ability to innovate, but at present its future is problematic.

The real impact of the Experiment in Higher Education was on other colleges and universities which have started similar programs. From the start, the Experiment wanted to prove that such a program would succeed, develop materials and techniques and train staff. Former staff members of the Experiment are now located at approximately 20 other institutions of higher education which have started similar programs. The principles developed by the Experiment have been incorporated into the new Special Services for the Disadvantaged Program of the U. S. Office of Education.

SIU operates other service programs in East St. Louis. It is involved in a number of manpower development programs and it offers technical assistance for various black enterprises. It continues to do research and evaluation, but many believe that East St. Louis has been researched to death.

A new community college has been opened in East St. Louis which is independent from the University. SIU had wanted to operate the junior college but was not successful and the fact that a community college is now located in East St. Louis which is not related to the University has further weakened SIU's ability to serve the community. Relations between SIU and the new college have not been cordial or cooperative.

The community college has been very aggressive in recruiting local black students. Free enrollment forms were printed in the local newspapers and 60% of the first students used these forms for their initial registration. Where Southern Illinois University's Experiment in Higher Education enrolled 200 freshmen a year, the new community college has an enrollment of 1,000. The curriculum has been set up to facilitate transfer to the Edwardsville campus at the end of two years.

In the fall of 1969, when the new community college opened, SIU returned the buildings that it had operated for years back to the local school system. (The school system claimed to need them. One former SIU faculty member claims that conservative elements in East St. Louis pressed to get the buildings back because they opposed SIU's efforts to improve the city because of the controversy those efforts engendered.) The few remaining efforts that SIU was making in East St. Louis were less effective because they were dispersed throughout the city. Lila Teer, the black former Community Development Services worker, who is now the coordinator of SIU activities in East St. Louis, said that she hopes the University will soon have a new center where all of its activities in East St. Louis are coordinated.

The Metropolitan Area of St. Louis, Missouri

Ever since the University established its campus at Edwardsville it has worked to develop the St. Louis metropolitan area east of St. Louis —that part in Illinois. Delyte Morris is Chairman of the Board of the Regional and Industrial Development Corporation, a six county effort in both Missouri and Illinois.

It is still too early to tell how much success the University will have in developing Metro East. However, the giant new campus at Edwardsville has already made a major economic contribution to the region and should serve as a focal point for further development. Another organization with which SIU is involved--Metro East--fights for Illinois' share of new facilities in the metropolitan area. For example, at present it is studying the feasibility of opening a second jetport to serve the region. It would be located in Illinois.

In a major effort to make the region better known and to bring people from St. Louis, Missouri across the river, Southern Illinois University stages the Mississippi River festival on the Edwardsville campus. The festival features the St. Louis Symphony Orchestra and big name performers such as Joan Baez and Van Cliburn. The festival can accomodate audiences of up to 15,000. The festival was first staged in the summer of 1969, and it lost $150,000, partially in one-time setting up costs, and it came in for considerable criticism. However, Delyte Morris is a tenacious person, and when he thinks he has a good idea he sees it through. It is probable that both the Mississippi River festival and Metro East regional development will be enduring successes.

SIU's involvement in and success at community development have largely been the result of Delyte Morris' willingness to pick good people without regard to academic qualifications and to give them freedom and resources. Not all of the ventures succeeded and the greatest successes did not endure. This suggests that the role of the University in non-educational endeavors is to pioneer new forms and not to operate such programs on a permanent basis. More effort should be put into the dissemination of successful innovations.

Morris's success has been due to his keeping in touch with the times and to his long range vision. At the same time he has been accused by some critics of being somewhat insensitive and ruthless. The University Services to Carbondale program and the black studies program were both the result of an occupation of the office of Delyte Morris by a group of black students. However, the black students who led the effort were expelled. Despite the fact that progress was made, a bad taste was left as far as some black students and faculty were concerned.

* * *

# WAYNE STATE:

# THE URBAN UNIVERSITY

by

Dan Waldorf

# Wayne State: The Urban University

Like many other cities in America, Detroit, the site of Wayne State University, has experienced a mass exodus of its affluent, white citizens out of the center city to its suburbs. Those left behind are, in large part, poor, black persons, many of whom are recent migrants from the South. With the black migration, there has been an increase in the demand for services. With the white exodus, there has been a decline in taxes and revenues which has caused many services previously provided by the City to be cut. The result has been a myriad of social problems--an increase in health problems as doctors have moved to the suburban areas; a decline in the number of housing units--caused by the clearing for freeways and by urban renewal--as more, and more decent, housing is needed; increased crime rates; a rising discontent with the extent and quality of education among persons long denied opportunity for education.

The City of Detroit has not been able to deal with these problems. In some ways, Detroit seems to be growing worse, not better. There is, however, hope that some of Detroit's problems will eventually be solved and that a new urban atmosphere may evolve. If there is to be a solution, part of it emanates from the efforts being made by the administration, faculty, and students of Wayne State University to attack social problems. Few universities have seen and met the challenges presented by urban problems as Wayne State has. It would seem that in nearly every school, in every department, there is someone with a social conscience who is attacking the problems of living in Detroit. Examples are innumerable and it is difficult to know where to begin describing the many ways Wayne

State is serving its community. Let me start with the things that interested me.

The first example is the effort of the WSU Medical School program at Detroit General Hospital to treat narcotic addiction with the synthetic narcotic, methadone. Detroit, along with New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago, is considered to have large numbers of heroin addicts. Aside from detoxification treatment, there had been only sporadic efforts to treat addiction in Detroit.

Dr. Ronald Krome, who formerly worked with narcotic addicts at the U. S. Public Health Hospital at Lexington, Kentucky, is responsible for starting the program. Along with his other duties as Detroit General's Director of Emergency Services and Assistant Professor of Surgery in the WSU School of Medicine, he started the program with very little money (overtime pay for two nurses and a salary for an ex-addict counselor) and some hope of additional funds from the City of Detroit.

By January of 1970, the program had taken in 34 persons, of whom 19 had remained. At the same time the patients are encouraged to live in a halfway house off the premises of the Hospital and attend group therapy sessions held by an ex-addict counselor twice a week. In addition, the patients are given extensive counseling services available at the Hospital and are expected either to work or to go to school within six weeks after joining the program.

The unusual thing about the program is that it was operated very matter of factly as a part of the normal services of Detroit General Hospital with a small staff and little money. The program was discontinued in November of 1970 when funds from the City were not forthcoming to support it.

Completely independent of these efforts to treat narcotic addicts is the drug education prevention program in the College of Pharmacy. The Dean of the College, Dr. Martin Barr, initiated the program and he said:

> I got started on the idea one night at Southfield. I was in the audience of a panel discussion about drugs. There was a panel of five persons and they unintentionally terrified the whole audience with horror stories. I knew then that there had to be other approaches, and that kicked off our whole program. I got both students and faculty involved in it; this year (1969-70) we have 20 students and 5 faculty members. They are all volunteers. We send someone out almost every day; last year we spoke to about 50,000 persons and this year about 30,000 already. We try to touch on all aspects of the problem--biochemistry, social, psychological, legal, etc. Naturally, the approach is tailored to the prospective participants: parents and professionals want facts and descriptions of symptoms to detect drug abuse; students want persons who can talk from their own experience. Students speak to students, faculty to adults. What we try to get across is a healthy respect for the short- and long-term effects of drugs. In addition, we are also training others (usually teachers) who will in turn go into schools. This year we enrolled 55 graduate teachers in a credit course on basic pharmacological concepts of drug abuse.

Dr. Barr and his associates realize the problems of using the traditional educational approaches to teach prevention of drug abuse. Such methods, while effective with adults and certain insulated adolescents, are not effective with sophisticated urban and suburban students who often have more experience and knowledge of drugs than those who are trying to teach them. They are attempting to forge new techniques and approaches that will be more effective.

Consumer Education

Quite removed from the problem of drug abuse, but another needed service provided to the Detroit inner city, was the consumer education project started by Mrs. Roberta McBride, Librarian in Wayne State's Archives of Labor History and Urban Affairs. She is described by those who know her as being quietly persistent. She must be, because the consumer education courses she has put together are very well organized and wide-reaching.

The program, which began in 1967, utilized not only Wayne State faculty members but experts from Michigan State's University Extension Service, the Credit Union League of Michigan, and many local organizations. Students in the classes were usually poor persons from more than 50 particularly effective in reaching the black communities--at the session I sat in on, 13 of the 20 students were black. What set the project apart from the usual was that each of the participants, after the course of study (45 weekly meetings), went back to his local community and taught a similar course. Using this multiplier effect, the project reached considerably larger numbers than the 50 persons enrolled in the project.

Mrs. McBride was enthusiastic about the participation of persons coming to the courses. She said that at least 20 or 30 persons showed up each week even during the coldest weather. Initially, it was thought that the courses would be held in the community on the premises of the participating agencies. The participants liked coming to the University and the University liked having them--classes were held in very pleasant, comfortable classrooms in the conference center at the University. Out of this pilot program has grown a for-credit consumer education program to be operated in 10 center by New Detroit, Inc.

## Community Extension Centers

Another imaginative program which is attempting to make University facilities available to the black inner city is the new Community Extension Centers program in the Division of Urban Extension. Prior to 1968, the Urban Extension of the University operated primarily in the white suburban noose surrounding Detroit, rather than in the central city. Decentralization of the Urban Extension facilities was proposed by Dean Hamilton Stillwell (now at Rutgers University) as a means of "bringing University Extension back home to the inner city by setting up centers in several black communities."

The initial plans for the program were developed by a black administrator, Conrad Mallett, who is highly regarded in Detroit as a result of his work with former Mayor Cavanagh and as the former Director of the Detroit Housing Commission. Mallett presently is Director of Wayne State's Office of Neighborhood Relations. The Extension Centers program was implemented by Mallett's successor, Hartford Smity, Jr., a bearded black man, an Assistant Professor in Wayne's School of Social Work. Professor Smith has been responsible for opening the first Community Extension Center.

Smith undertook a study of several city neighborhoods and finally settled on locating the first center in one of the poorest sections of the City's Near East Side, in the Model Neighborhood area. Approximately half the persons in the selected area had incomes of less than $4,000 per year, and crime, delinquency, and unemployment are among the highest in the city. Recreational services were also found to be very inadequate. The Center facility selected is a large activities building, formerly used by the parochial school system. The facility was selected, re-designed, and renovated to accommodate the community's interests and needs as revealed by preliminary surveys. An Advisory Board made up of community residents was selected and the first operational plan for the Center was set up by them. The overall plan called for a multipurpose neighborhood center that would contain a variety of educational, cultural, and recreational programs. The recreation program component was the starting point because of the urgency and immediacy associated with the hot summer months just ahead. Smith said:

> It must be realized that this was more than just another summer recreation program. First, it was an attempt to stick to the wise philosophy of starting where the people are; and second, it was made clear by the residents that it should be recreation with a purpose--recreation that could be used to get people involved in doing something about conditions affecting them also encouraging them to participate in the educational and cultural programs in operation and being planned for the Center.

In the fall of 1969, the Center started its second stage of development by offering courses at the college level. These were basic courses: English composition and literature, sociology and social problems, and introductory psychology. All were taught by regular Wayne State faculty selected by Smith's division. There was also a noncredit community service course for community leaders which attempted to relate various urban problems such as drug abuse, housing, and welfare to community law.

Initial efforts to start noncredit community courses did not meet with overwhelming success. Professor Smith explained:

> Yeah, we made a few mistakes last year. We didn't know the psychology of charging fees in this community. Here it was, we were offering courses free, and they had a peculiar philosophy that shot us down. I guess they felt: 'if it's worth a damn, it has to be worth at least a buck--you get nothing free in this world.' So we revamped the whole thing, charged $5, and got 2 community leaders to sign up for the course. In addition, there were strong negative feelings about noncredit programs because of a history of poor acceptance and meaning to employers.

In addition to the credit and noncredit courses, there were informal courses which generally took the form of tutorials: these were in reading, mathematics, and refreshers for people planning to take the High School Equivalency tests. To illustrate how one person got into such a course, Professor Smith told this story:

> We have this one kid, you know, a real tough dude. He's about 17 years old, out of school, and has raised a lot of hell in the community and in our recreation program. A couple of staff members saw him packing a rod before we made our 'no weapons' rule. On a couple of occasions he had threatened to close down the Center. He was banned for a month, but gradually he has come to accept the Center's rules and discipline. One day recently, he came to me and asked if he could sign up for a tutorial in the High School Equivalency course so that he might eventually get into some college credit courses at the Center.
>
> I think having the rec program like we do can encourage many persons like this one to get started taking courses, especially when they are both offered in the same plant and not across town in alien country.

In addition to these activities, the Center has a separate contract with a group of welfare mothers who are trying to get themselves off welfare by learning typing and stenography. There is a large demand for such jobs in Detroit which is not being met. A well-equipped clerical laboratory facility was made available by the Department of Business Education on Wayne's main campus. During the first term, 40 women signed up and attended regularly. Professor Smith explained:

> The need of this group of welfare mothers for some kind of day care for their children while the mothers are in class caused us to start to think about developing some self-sustaining day-care units which would allow persons participating in the programs to bring children along with them and not have to worry about getting a baby-sitter. Things aren't always as neat, well-ordered, or easily tied into an educational ball; when you go into a community where there are a lot of needs you have to try to relate your program to this whole range of needs. If what they need is X and you are offering Y, you simply aren't responding to them appropriately. At a university, things have to fit into nice, neat places, but that isn't where the real world is.

The problems of setting up such a program are continuous, according to the Director:

> There's no problem getting people into the Center--and especially kids--because of the gym. Our real problem is getting them there in some order. We were pretty loose at first--too loose, I'm sure--and we had a crisis a day. Someone was always confronting us with something. Many of the problems and conflicts of the larger community were becoming a part of the Center as the

> Center became more a part of the community. There are many 'tests' and battles for control. For instance, one day a group of tough dudes came into the Center Director's office, came in and told him that they were planning to take over the place and if he didn't let them take it over, they were going to bomb it down. Well, he let them talk for a while and then told them that like any other place, there were certain rules about using the Center, and then he told them why and laid it out for them--one, two, three, four. . . . Well, they made some grumbling noises, said they were going to burn it down, and left. But they started living with the rules eventually.
>
> Yes, we've had headaches and there have been some days when I wondered why I ever took this job. On one particularly bad day there was a disagreement and a fight among three or four young adults from rival factions in the community. We did know that this had occurred. Members of one group were playing basketball in the gym, and the other group found out about it and came to the Center to take out their revenge for this earlier incident. One cat smuggled in a sawed-off shotgun underneath his coat. Our first indication of trouble was when we saw him aim the gun at someone down on the gym floor. Well, everybody ran for the door and began melting into corners. . . the toughest cats were the first ones out. I ran into my office and called the cops, from the safest position I could find--on the floor behind my desk--out of sight.
>
> In the meantime, one staff member had gotten close to the cat with the gun, got an angle on him and knocked the gun out of his hands. It clattered on the floor, they had a little scuffle over who was going to get it, and then some of the other staff closed in, and got the gun. Then the police force arrived, and you wouldn't believe it. It was the tactical force and they came in all their glory--12 cars, full battle gear, rifles, pump-action shotguns, etc. I thought we were going to have a real one then. The people thought they were being invaded--tension and feeling started to run very high and very warm. I was glad when that day was over.

Smith went on to say:

> There are real human successes, however, which make it all worthwhile. For example, the cat who had had the shotgun--we were able to reach him later on. Eventually we got him interested in college. He has good artistic skills and we eventually hired him to work at the Center. So it all somehow works out in the end.

At the time of my visit, the program was just beginning and it was difficult to make any real evaluation or assessment of its effectiveness. The recreation program seemed to serve as a good entree to the other activities in the Center. The thing that was the most impressive was the generally loose and open attitude of the staff which allowed them to respond to suggestions made by the people who used the facilities.

At the time of the 1969 visit, there were only 25 students enrolled in college courses. In the spring of 1971, it had grown to 200 students in college credit courses, with a vastly increased number and range of course choices--still taught by Wayne State faculty (and an occasional Dean) for the most part. After 12 hours of B work or 16 hours of C work, students may and are encouraged to "transfer" to the main campus. Some of the original students from the Center and regular Wayne State students serve as paid team leaders, to help new Center students make the transition to full campus work. About 80 students, including one welfare mother who has 8 children, have transferred to the main campus for regular college degree work.

The Center has also developed a range of instruction for paraprofessionals in Community Service agencies in ghetto areas. It also has developed mechanisms for providing high school completion work and technical orientation and training for 125 high school drop-outs. Fifty adults attend a similar Basic Educational High School completion program at night. Many of these persons, also, may move onto the college credit track.

Smith has now been moved into the role of planning additional developments in other parts of Detroit, and has been given increased funding from the University to employ a Center Director--Preston C. Bright, and an assistant to Bright, Silas Norman, both young, black, bright and energetic. In addition, Mrs. Elza Adderley, an attractive black woman who was the only professional on the staff aside from Smith at the time of the site visit, now supervises the counseling and admissions work of the college credit program, and assists Smith in developing contracts and training programs to meet other needs of the community.

In addition, Smith and his staff have arranged for community groups to actually run certain aspects of the Center's program. For example, a citizens' organized and operated cooperative called "Project C. H. I. L. D." now manages day care programs. The Wayne Athletic Association, a similar citizens' group, operates basketball and baseball leagues through the Center. Both groups receive the technical assistance of the Center staff. Finally, the Consumer Education program, under the Consumer Research Advisory Council, a league of community organizations, has its headquarters at the Center and is well on its way to developing its own professional staff and activities. Together with Smith and his staff, they are expected to plan a large role in the future in consumer affairs as they affect the poor and the minority groups in Detroit.

The Center is also meeting its stated goal of becoming a "cultural hub in the community" by presenting plays, encouraging the development of drama clubs, etc. for the young, talent shows, educational field trips, special community-related workshops and conferences, and speakers' program. If its programming continues at its present pace, the East Side Center will have to expand its present facilities.

## Special Student Programs

During the 1967-68 academic year, the undergraduate black population at Wayne State University was 8.8 per cent of the 22,600 undergraduates. Of the large publicly-supported colleges and universities in the United States, Wayne had the highest percentage of black undergraduates. Over the last three years, this percentage has increased: 10.3 per cent in 68-69, 13.3 per cent in 69-70, and 14.8 per cent in 70-71. The overall black student population, graduate and undergraduate, accounts for 15.6 per cent of the student body in 70-71. These increases were not made without concerted effort on the part of the University to make itself more available to its neighbors.

A good deal of the increase in black student enrollment at Wayne is directly attributable to the Special Student Service Programs, a general title under which fall several programs, including the Higher Education Opportunities Committee--HEOC--which is the Talent Search program at WSU. HEOC was started in 1963 by Wayne faculty and Detroit citizens to provide financial support for needy but academically successful black graduates of Detroit high schools. Upward Bound, also under SSSP, was started at Wayne in 1966 and was cited in a national evaluation by Greenleigh Associates in 1969 as the operational model for all Upward Bound programs in the country. The third major SSSP program is Project 350, a thriving program built during 1968-69 from two 1967-68 experimental efforts which had been informally designated Project 300 and Project 50 for the number of students each one included.

Project 300, Wayne's first experimental admissions program of any major size, was born in 1967-68 when Wayne relaxed its admissions policies and accepted 300 applicants who had been denied admission on their first try and whose grade point averages were 2.0 to 2.3, just below the customary GPA requirements. Called, not inaccurately, the "cream of the rejects," these students were selected from around the state solely on the basis of their GPA, which resulted in a preponderance of suburban (i.e., white) students; graduates from Detroit's inner city high schools accounted for only some 20 per cent of this group.

That same summer, Project 50 was persuaded into being by the then Assistant Dean of Students Murray E. Jackson and the then Director of HEOC Noah Brown, Jr. (Brown became Director of Special Student Service

Programs in the fall of 1968, and in July of 1970 he was named Vice President for Student Affairs.) Both Jackson and Brown are native Detroiters, both black, and both very strong-minded. They saw that by using the GPA as the only guide to selection, students from the predominantly black high schools in Detroit's central city would be systematically excluded. The students in Project 50 were chosen more or less randomly by Jackson and Brown, and there were actually 52 students, 50 of them black. The philosophy and the leadership of Project 50 and Project 300 were "merged" in October of 1968, and Project 350 was created (or re-created) under drastically changed selection and program guidelines for the 1969-70 school year. The Project has maintained its annual admission level of 350 students and in the summer of 1971, the total number of students who have been admitted under this special effort reached 1,400.

Noah Brown convened a "Campus Planning Committee" for special programs, composed of representatives from a variety of units related to student personnel services and academic instruction. This conglomerate of faculty, administrators and students continues to mastermind the programming activities of the Special Student Service Programs division.

Mr. Brown also convened a "Community Advisory Committee on Special Student Programs and Summer Job Placement," composed of citizens who represent a wide range of Detroit concerns: the municipal department of Parks and Recreation, a major public housing project, the City's poverty program umbrella agency called the Mayor's Committee for Human Resources Development (MCHRD), public and parochial high school teachers and principals, the Detroit Board of Education, the Varsity Club (black athletes), and a unique nonprofit job placement agency called Volunteer

Placement Corps. This Committee is responsible each year for identifying and recruiting 50 of the 350 students from across its reach of community contacts, and for helping with jobs and job counseling for all Project students during their entire University careers.

With the extremely active assistance of these two broad-based groups, Brown shifted the recruitment guidelines for Project 350 from the quantitative GPA selection method to a method which is based principally on the federal government's income data for Detroit, that is, recruitment is concentrated in those areas surrounding public and parochial high schools where there is the greatest percentage of low-income families. Basing recruitment and admission in the poverty "target areas" allows Wayne to draw upon a population of students almost universally overlooked by recruiters from other colleges and universities. The criteria used to identify an area as a "target area" include family income level, level of unemployment, high school drop-out rate, and ethnic composition. Consideration of all these data along with the individual student's grade record in high school, his motivations and aspirations as identified by teachers and counselors, and the results of the standard admission test scores gives Wayne a loosely-woven but relatively coherent set of indicators for potential success in their university careers of the Project 350 students.

Noah Brown is an amazing man who absolutely bubbles with energy and enthusiasm for his work. Everyone I met and talked with about Project 350 (he was then still Director of SSSP) was caught up in his infectious enthusiasm for his work and his students. He is committed completely to the job of getting black--and other minority--students into Wayne State and making sure that they have the best chance to stay there until such time as they finish whatever they are seeking.

Physically, Mr. Brown is a large, robust black man. One would never think from his physical manner that he was a star basketball player at Wayne State after his World War II army service, but after one is exposed to his enthusiasm, it is easy to tell what kind of player he was--full of hustle, always down the court first on the fast break.

He has a great gift for "turning people on" to his ideas. Everyone on his staff is said to be "hooked" on him and on the Project. Mr. Brown provides this inspiration in several ways--as an energetic director, as a sympathetic, warm person, and as an impassioned and effective speaker. This last was illustrated when I sat in on an advisory meeting in 1969 when Mr. Brown was refuting a statement made by a faculty member that the Community Advisory Committee was merely a "blue ribbon" committee. He spoke with sincere emotion about the Project, himself, and the work of the Community Committee in the style of an old-time black preacher. When his speech was over, there wasn't a dry eye around the table and everyone, including myself, felt a surge of emotion, a feeling of being uplifted.

In 1969-70, the second year of Project 350, Brown had things better organized. All 350 places were filled--250 marginal students and 100 "high-risk" students--and in addition to these, he was able, on very short notice, to recruit an additional 67 students for a similar program at Michigan State University.

Counseling and tutoring were expanded during the second year of the program. Counseling is aggressive--and mandatory. Students in Project 350 are contacted every week individually either in person or by telephone. Each of the counseling sessions is recorded on a special report sheet so that there is very close monitoring or follow-up of each student's progress. The counselor-student ratio is 1:60, and each counselor stays with the same students throughout the year in order to maintain continuity and to establish the maximum possible personal relationship.

In addition to scheduled counseling, there is a tutorial center where students may go for assistance either when they think they need it or when they are referred by their counselors. All of the tutors and counselors at this time were black--most of them are students who themselves entered the University through special admission programs--and the majority of students in Project 350 is black. Many of the special tutors are graduate fellows who are assigned by their instructional departments.

As well as providing services to the participants, the Project has made special efforts with the Office of Scholarships and Financial Aids to streamline all procedures for application for financial assistance. Aid to each student is "packaged" after interviews with the student, with his parents, during which the extent of need is determined. As much as is possible of the aid to entering Project 350 students is in the form of grants, through the Educational Opportunity Grant program, since Wayne feels that it places an unnecessarily heavy burden on new students to take on loans right from the beginning. Many are assisted in getting part-time jobs, most through College Work-Study, to help pay their own way through--another important thing in Wayne's view. As a last resort almost, National Defense Student Loans are included in the first-year student's financial assistance "package."

The problem--not only at Wayne, but at schools all over the country which recruit large numbers of low-income students--is that while the number of such students is increasing as they begin to believe the "educational opportunity" message--a very wholesome sign for higher education in general--the sources and amount of financial assistance for these students are diminishing and Wayne, like many other urban institutions, is left holding the bag. The federal aid to needy students dwindies steadily, almost a reverse reflection of the rise in their numbers knocking at admissions office doors.

Some Academic Advisors were assigned through the College of Liberal Arts Advising division to work with the specially admitted students. The reasons for the assigned team of experienced Advisors were: (1) to establish a milieu to develop meaningful relationships; (2) to make Advisors accessible to the students on regular basis; (3) to give the students a feeling of belonging; (4) to learn as much as possible about the students and their experiences and problems; and (5) to use academic knowledge, new approaches to program planning, and the broadest available experience to help the students to succeed. One of the approaches to program planning is to help the students to be successful in their initial efforts to complete course requirements--especially including courses in which they have specified particular interest--and to distribute courses to insure variety and a reasonable volume of reading. Miss Marjorie A. Edwards, Academic Advisor and the College's Academic Advisor for Special Programs, has worked with the special program students since the beginning. She commented:

> It is important that an Academic Advisor is realistic when advising the specially admitted students, particularly during their first year. During this period the students are gradually becoming oriented to

> college and to the expectations of college and the curricula. They may indicate choices which at that point may seem unrealistic because of strong evidence from their records that much supportive work has to be done if their stated goals are to be achieved. It is important, however, that this be explained in terms the students can understand so that it is not conveyed to them that they are prohibited from making their own choices, but only that some choices have to be delayed until they have had a chance to demonstrate through their academic performance whether it is a good choice or not. This demonstration has to be cautiously allowed by the Advisor so as not to jeopardize the students' general academic situation. Motivation, innate ability, and latent development can sometimes baffle our expectations of students, so their freedom to choose must not be stifled. There seems to be somewhat less of the seemingly unrealistic choices expressed as goals among the second and current groups of students.

Though the incidents are few, some of the adjustments that the 1969 and 1970 specially admitted students had to make have to do with integrated classroom situations where black students were in a minority. Miss Edwards tells a story of one first-year student who apparently never had been in an integrated classroom where black students were in the minority. At Wayne, she was attending an introductory social science class in which there were only six or seven black students. Both the black and the white students tended to sit by themselves. The girl informed Miss Edwards that her instructor was a racist and was not concerned about black students because he was not addressing his lectures to all students but only to the white students. (This, of course, was largely a result of the examples the instructor used in class which really applied only to the white students, and naturally the white students found them to be more interesting and relevant to their experience than the black students did.) The instructor was also said to fix his eyes only in one area of the classroom--which was not in the black students' direction. The student took all of this very personally.

Miss Edwards tried to analyze the situation, being sure not to take sides, and told the girl to try an experiment--she should take a seat in another area of the classroom away from the other black students and observe if the instructor still seemed to address his lecture and discussion only to the white students. It was also impressed upon the student that she had paid her tuition for that class and that she belonged there. She was encouraged to talk to her classmates and she was told that if she still felt she had a problem after trying what was suggested, to return. The student returned at the end of the quarter and told Miss Edwards that her fears were unfounded and that she had talked to the instructor whom she decided really was concerned about all of the students in his class.

Summarising her approach with the specially admitted students, Miss Edwards said:

> I guess we have to give the special students the extra attention. We have to help orient them to the University and to college life. They seem to have more need for this kind of attention than the regularly admitted students--maybe because they are often the first in their family to go to college. We also have to allow them to express their feelings and encourage rapport since these are some of the ways we can eliminate some of the sort of vague problems that could be affecting normal academic progress. The special programs Academic Advisor team must make a real effort to accomplish this, and from what is shown in my records of the academic progress of the specially admitted students, it seems to be paying off.

Indeed it has paid off. After the first quarter (during which the students took two courses for credit and one noncredit course) 104 (or 47%) of the 219 had attained a 2.0 grade point average. Another 104 were on probation with a grade point average below 2.0. Eleven or 6% had either withdrawn or had incomplete grades. By the end of the first academic year (Spring 1969), 95 (or 43.6%) of the original 219 had grade point averages of 2.0 or better, while 123 (56.4%) had averages below 2.0. Of these probation students, 7 had been excluded from the program because of poor performance, 9 had dropped out of college, and 31 had failed to re-enroll for the new quarter for a wide variety of reasons. The attrition of 47 (or 21%) among the special program students has proved to be very little different from that of regularly enrolled freshmen. The majority of students who were on probation had deficiency ranges of -1 through -15; this range is considered to be academically salvageable.

The median grade point average for all special students was 2.0, but six persons had averages of 3.0 or better. The best grades were in English and Psychology. The general trend is for all students to improve their grades as they learn better how to study and as they become accustomed to University life. Many of these students show definite promise of doing better as they move along.

### The Co-Op (Co-operative Work and Study) Educational Program

Another program at Wayne State primarily to assist black students is the Co-op program. This was begun at the instigation of Benson Manlove, a tall, confident black man who said was probably destined to become a pimp or street hustler until he went to college. While a senior in the School of Business Administration, he went to the President with his observation that there were very few black students in the Business School and in the College of Engineering, and said he wanted to work on plans to get more black students into these two schools, particularly. One of his plans was the Co-op program of alternating terms of work and school. President Keast liked Mr. Manlove and his ideas and appointed him as Assistant to the President practically on the spot, in the summer of 1968.

The Co-op program opened in the summer of 1969 with 20 students. It was enlarged in the fall to 100 students, and added another 80 in the winter. Manlove's goal for 200 students during the first year was met.

Students may enter the Co-op program after they have completed 80 hours of credit with at least a 2.0 grade point average. The majority of students now in the program already were enrolled at Wayne State before joining the Co-op program, but considerable efforts were in the planning for the second year to recruit from junior and community college in the Detroit area. The program takes five years to complete, and many students are resistant to the idea of such a long commitment despite the fact that the average student at Wayne State takes five years to finish an undergraduate degree.

Students in the program are enthusiastic about the Co-op idea. In a group interview I held with five black students, Julia, a slim, pretty girl about 25 years old who had been at Wayne State for six years working part-time toward her degree in accounting said she felt a certain relief after joining the Co-op:

> Co-op is a lot better, you know--you're not as pushed. When I was working at Wayne and going to school, too, I never felt like a student. I was always having to rush here and do this, rush there and do that. I was busy all the time, but now I've got time to relax and to do some things besides working and studying.

Julia earned $600 a month at her Co-op placement which was considerably more than she earned working part-time. This money allows her to have more leisure, to do things that other less financially pressed students do.

Jerome, an engineering student, said he particularly liked the Co-op program because it allowed him to apply knowledge he gained in classes. During his placement, Jerome worked in the product improvement division of Cadillac. His job was to determine and rectify a drive-shaft failure which was occurring on Cadillacs. Defective drive-shafts were sent to the Cadillac plant from all over the country where extensive analyses were made of the damages. These data were put on punch cards and run through a computer to determine the cause of failure. The computer did not discover the reason for the failures, but Jerome did after he observed the installation of the drive-shafts on the assembly line. It seemed that many of the drive-shafts got dropped and damaged during installation and then were further damaged when they were forced into place. He discovered this only after extensive on-site observation and these observations were confirmed by dismantling the drive-shafts and checking the damage before they left the plant. The assembly line workers were told of the resulting damages and how to avoid them.

The only criticism of the Co-op program arising out of one group discussion was that there was not enough information disseminated before the program began, and persons in the program did not know enough either about their placement or about the structure of the program. Of the five students, one disliked her job placement and another felt that he did not get enough supervision at his placement to make it meaningful to his course in industrial relations.

The plan for the second year of the program (1970-71) was to recruit another 200 students and to expand the Co-op program plan into the chemistry department and the department of journalism.

Manlove's enthusiasm for Co-oping is so great that he organized a group of blacks in the National Cooperative Education Association to encourage the development of similar programs in black colleges, mostly in the South. It was his and his group's plan to serve as aggressive consultants to go to black colleges and universities to sell the co-op idea much more actively than it has been in the past. They did this in 1969 and 1970 in several colleges throughout the south, with great success.

Manlove believes that the Co-op is a particularly good way to get black graduates into the good job market:

> Co-op is a natural for the South and for that matter, the North as well. It gives the student needed confidence and experience. By the time he has his degree, he has one or two years of experience on a job in his field. He has more to offer his prospective employer.

One of the interesting outcomes of Manlove's interest and activity in the College of Engineering and the School of Business Administration is that black students in those two units have established associations of black students which are independent of the larger University Association of Black Students. They are organized and focused around vocational and professional interests rather than on the broad political and black studies interests of the ABS. Both the associations are self-help oriented, and were initiated with the goals of cutting down the attrition rate of black students in the two colleges and to show what black students can do for themselves and for their colleges as an organized group.

## Summer Science Research Program

Programs for the poor, underprivileged inner city child appear in unexpected places at Wayne State--such an unexpected place is the Physics Department. Persons with social consciences at Wayne are not restricted to any one department. They seem to abound everywhere.

This program attempts to bring relatively high ability high school juniors and seniors from the inner city into physical science laboratories as interns, where they work directly with a graduate research assistant under direct supervision of a professor. The intern works 7 hours a day, 5 days a week in the laboratory, with a weekly lecture given by various professors in the department. There is a specific attempt to stay away from a school-like atmosphere (the students need a change after 10 months in school) and a strong emphasis on real work situations which will allow the participants to stretch beyond their present level of functioning.

This is not a "make-work" program. From its inception, the program was conceived to assist the Physics Department as well as the interns. Professor Leonard O. Roellig, the thoughtful and able director of the project, said that he continually stresses to professors who request interns that they make the work interesting and take time to teach the interns specific tasks that they must learn in order to do the job.

The graduate student under whom the intern works serves as a link between the intern and the professor. It is with the graduate student that the intern works in a close, day-to-day relationship and it is expected that the graduate student will take a personal interest in the laboratory intern and make a special effort to get to know him or her. Graduate students are encouraged to take the interns to the Student Center, to show them around the campus, to socialize informally, and generally to serve as role models.

Professor Roellig said of the high school students:

> Most of the interns who come to the program have never known a college-educated individual as a person, in contrast to youth of today's middle-class suburbia who have friends, relatives, and neighbors who have successfully completed college. Our program provides the opportunity for the interns to develop a close personal relationship with college people and at the same time, it gives them the opportunity to learn what it is like to be a research physicist, chemist, or biologist. Generally, the work is varied; it

depends upon the specific lab and what tasks have to be done. Students may analyze data, make measurements, build apparatus, take field trips, etc.

The program grew out of the interest of Professor Roellig, and Professors Alvin Saperstein and Melbourne Stewart, also of the Physics Department, in the inner city student. It began in 1967, when 20 interns were brought into the Physics Department. Of that original group, 16 were black and 4 white. Being black is not a particular criterion for the program, although the predominant numbers have been black so far. Similarly, inner city schools are emphasized because it is felt that the students from these schools would derive the greatest benefit from the program.

During 1968, the program was expanded into two more departments--Chemistry and Biology--and brought in 64 interns (62 black and 2 white). It was found that there were not enough meaningful jobs for that number of interns in the three departments over the summer, so in 1969 and 1970, the number was cut back to 40. The program will include 41 students in the summer of 1971, and the College of Engineering may participate along with the three science departments.

Results of the program have been most encouraging. During the spring of 1968, Professor Roellig sent cards to all 20 of the students who participated in the 1967 program asking them to come to a group meeting at Wayne State. Thirteen came to the meeting and of that number, 12 were in or were accepted by some college or university; many felt they were able to get scholarships because of their participation in the program. Many professors in the program were helpful by writing recommendations for individual interns, based on their knowledge of their abilities and work habits.

During 1969, graduate students from the School of Social Work did a follow-up study of 50 of the 64 students in the 1968 Summer Science Program, and found that 86 per cent of the responding participants felt that the project was beneficial to them. Ten per cent of the interns said that they had changed their career goals and that they planned to pursue a science career as a result of their participation in the program. (Sixty per cent of the high school students were already directed toward science careers before taking part in the program, which was why they were selected.)

Original funding for the program had come from three sources: Neighborhood Youth Corps of OEO, New Detroit, Inc., (an agency made up of local businessmen and civic leaders which grew out of the ashes of the riots of 1967), and from Wayne State itself. The proposed budget for the 1970 program was $32,000.

## Influencing Social Policy

Traditionally, schools of social work have placed graduate students in social agencies to learn case work, psychiatric social work, group work, or community organization as student-practitioners under supervision. More recently, there has been a heavy increase in interest in the community social work component. Wayne State's School of Social Work has experienced this shift of emphasis, but as is characteristic of the whole University, has taken the idea much farther. Their innovation is the placement of graduate students in community organization in the offices of politicians as legislative ombudsmen who deal with the problems of the inner city and the poor. Associate Professor Elizabeth J. Phillips, an enthusiastic advocate of this idea, said of the placements: "We're working within the political system to participate in the development of state and federal legislation for social domestic programs needed in the local communities."

This program began in September of 1966 with placements to four legislators--one United States Congressman, two State legislators, and a Detroit Common Councilman. By the 1969-70 school year, 11 students were placed with 6 legislators and 3 legislative agencies. Students spend three days a week in the office of the legislator and the other two days in class for a whole school year.

The experience of students is very illuminating, as I found out in a group interview with the 11 students and 3 faculty members who were involved in the program. The following is from the notes I took at that meeting:

> Three of the students--William Long, Jewell Burdette, and Robert Santos-- were, with one of the faculty members, Assistant Professor William Iverson, working in the office of Congressman John Conyers, Jr. The principal duties of the three placements were to handle constituents' complaints. Whenever a constituent either writes or calls Congressman Conyers about a specific grievance, it is the intern's job to learn the specific of the particular complaint and to make some effort to satisfy the constituent. Complaints ranged from the very personal--a man trying to get unemployment benefits after being told twice by the employment office that he didn't qualify--to the larger national issues such as the draft, the war in Vietnam, urban environment, big city problems, etc.
>
> The students had direct but infrequent access to the Congressman himself, but all worked very closely with members of his staff in his local Detroit office.
>
> In addition to the routine work of handling constitutent complaints, each of the three specialized in specific projects with which the Congressman was working. For example, Robert Santos had been working extensively with consumer groups on consumer fraud. One of the initial efforts of this special project was to work with the United Farm Workers to stage a boycott of grapes picked by nonunion workers--the grapes were being sold in certain of the larger supermarkets. This led to other efforts concerning specific consumer problems.
>
> None of the three thought that he was too effective in influencing either the Congressman or his staff, but felt that the

experience was worth it because it allowed him an opportunity to see how the political scene was run and how he could be more effective as a social worker and as a citizen.

Of another mind was Edward Darnell, a black student who was placed with Coleman Young, a black State Senator who is said to have close relations with his constituents and is attempting to involve himself in more of the peoples' needs than most of the other State legislators, either Senators or Representatives. Mr. Darnell's principal job was to explain and promote Senator Young's plan for school decentralization in Detroit. (Senator Young was the principal author of a plan to alter the overcentralized Detroit public school system.) Mr. Darnell spoke to various groups--large and small, black and white--about the decentralization plan.

Mr. Darnell is very close to the scene (one of the reasons is that Senator Young does not have as large a staff as Congressman Conyers') and often finds himself being asked by the Senator for his opinions about a whole range of issues. Mr. Darnell said that initially, this 'threw him' because he didn't feel as familiar as he might have about particular issues or the roles of different people and the kinds of influence they have. In time he gained confidence and now states his opinions and evaluations candidly with the Senator and feels he has a specific effect on the opinions of the Senator.

Another example of the range of placements was that of Paul Hubbard, a tall, outspoken black man who was placed with the Association of Black Students at Wayne State. ABS had been reorganized and revitalized a few years back by Lonnie Peek, a graduate Social Work student at that time, and Peek had set the model for succeeding Social Work students with the group. The placement is justified by the Social Work faculty on the grounds that ABS is involved routinely in larger community problems than just those at Wayne. According to Mr. Hubbard, the general goals of ABS are to sensitize the black people on the campus and in the community to the needs and problems out in the community, and if that entails such topics as the war in Vietnam or police brutality in the black community, then these issues are taken up by ABS.

Mr. Hubbard said he works very closely both with the black student leaders and with local community leaders in the areas immediately adjacent to the University in the Model Cities designated areas. Hubbard seemed to identifystrongly with the Association's goals, policies, and the means of attaining them. He seemed very exuberant about his work and expressed a great deal of personal satisfaction about the attainments of the Association of Black Students at Wayne.

The approach to the political placements generally is bi-partisan. However, the values and social philosophy of the legislators are crucial in any placement. Politicians like to have interns because they are free staff. The selection of politicians' offices for placement sites depends upon the learning opportunities, the level of government the political host represents, his legislative interests and voting record, and, most important, if his values are compatible with the profession of social work.

It is generally understood by the students and by the host legislator that the students are to deal with issues that are particularly relevant to social issues. The use of these legislative-ombudsmen-interns seems a good way for universities to contribute to the legislative process. It is good experience for the student; he gets to learn how the political machinery works and how he may function in that machine. The legislator, on the other hand, gets needed help, and in some cases may be exposed to a social philosophy different from his own. Further, many of these interns have extensive experience with specific social problems.

Limits of space do not allow descriptions of other programs of the School of Social Work, but they, like nearly all schools at Wayne State, are active in a variety of projects that relate to the inner city and to the problems of the poor and the black communities.

## Wayne's Urban Emphasis

Wayne State's involvement with the problems of the city is long-standing. It seems to be an inherited tradition. Before becoming a large University, it was a collection of municipal colleges with a strong community orientation (a so-called "street car" college). The orientation has not changed with all of the changes that have occurred during the University's fast growth. While Wayne State is no longer a prototype community college, it is definitely involved in the community, educating its citizens and providing services to its neighbors.

Both the past and the present leadership at Wayne has carried on the tradition of urban involvement. The current president, William R. Keast (he retired in June 1971), carried Wayne's tradition even further by making urban involvement the major focus of the entire University. President Keast, whose energy belies his shock of white hair, proposed in a 1967 address to the University faculty that the goal for Wayne State is: ". . . to be the nation's unique urban university, and to envision a day when other institutions will look to us for the new patterns by which universities will help create a more humane urban society."

This goal of the University was to be attained by (1) modifying admissions policies and encouraging minority student enrollment not only for undergraduate students but for graduate students as well; (2) developing new methods of measuring and rewarding promise and/or competence in high-quality teaching and distinguished service to the community as well as scholarship and research; (3) providing needed services to the community throughout the University wherever it can, and particularly through such agencies as the Center for Urban Studies and the Community Extension Centers program.

Indeed, Wayne State has gone some way toward fulfilling these goals. Over one year black enrollment increased 25 per cent--from 3,338 in 1968-69, to 4,421 in 1969-70. A further increase of 15 per cent was made with other minority groups, from 867 to 993. Combining the two, there was an increase in minority student enrollment of 29 per cent, while the total increase in University enrollment was only 5 per cent.

Increases in the graduate and professional school enrollments are not as dramatic, but have shown marked improvement. The Law School in 1970-71 has only 6.2 per cent black students; this nearly doubled from

26 students in 1968-69, to 58 students in 1970-71. Similarly, the School of Medicine, with 8.7 per cent minority students in all programs in 1970-71, increased numbers from 28 in 1968-69 to 72 1970-71. Greater percentages are shown in the fields of lesser prestige which traditionally have been more open to minority student enrollment: these are, in 1970-71, Social Work with 28.1 per cent; Education with 19.1 per cent; and Nursing with 19.5 per cent. The College of Liberal Arts, the omnium gatherum of any large university, has an overall total minority student enrollment of 16.4 per cent in 1970-71.

Services abound at Wayne, as I have tried to illustrate with my earlier description of those programs that I thought were unusual or out of the ordinary. A more comprehensive, although older, enumeration of programs at Wayne may be found in the University's own publication, Wayne and the Inner City: A Survey of Urban Concern, published in the fall of 1968.

There has not by any means been a suspension of the usual academic standards for judging competence (the usual publish or perish edict), and there are problems throughout the University of the more traditional kind. Richard Simmons, Jr., an Associate Director of the Center for Urban Studies, and Associate Professor in the School of Social Work, explained the problems of the Center for Urban Studies:

> There are and will be problems--and we don't minimize them for a minute--because community service just doesn't figure in any university reward system. You're not going to get promoted for all those meetings you attend in the local community or for anything that you might do out there. The only place in the University where I see this reward system breaking down is, perhaps, in the School of Social Work, which has in its short addition been more involved with community activities and community service than any other single school at the University--but even there, you more or less have to publish or perish.

I believe, however, that there exists a climate at Wayne State where standards may be modified, if not changed altogether. At Wayne State, persons are judged by services they perform for the community, but they also are judged by traditional standards as well. The problem is that Wayne State is not an island--Wayne is part of a much larger social system. And the larger social system is much more traditional than Wayne State is--publication record and academic peer recognition means more to the larger system than the ability to teach well and to serve the community. Professor Roellig may get recognition at Wayne State for his fine program to educate the inner city science student, but he will not be recognized by the larger physics or science community unless he also does the things they expect of him. Until such a time as the larger system changes, Wayne itself will be something of an anomaly. Let us be thankful for anomalies.

Not everything goes well at Wayne. One of the major efforts of President Keast to give emphasis and focus to much of the urban involvement at Wayne has had serious internal and external problems and a recent change in leadership. This is the Center for Urban Studies. The Center was established in 1968 in order: "to draw all the major schools, colleges, and divisions into a flexible and increasingly maturing network which recognizes both their (each school, college, and division) independence and their interdependence, and utilizes both in enhancing their capabilities for response to urbanization."

The Center is responsible for four basic areas: research, education, international urban studies, and community activities, but, according to Professor Simmons, ". . . it's community activity (throughout the University) that will be the cutting edge. . . . That will be the difference between the Center for Urban Studies at Wayne--a center that wants to get things done and to work in the local community--and other institutes formed around urban problems."

The Center was given substantial support, funds, and staff by the University to accomplish its goals. During its first year of operations--a full-time Director was named in January 1969--a good deal was accomplished, most notably an exchange program of European urban planners, the publication of a fact book of planning data for Detroit, a Conference of Urban Studies Directors from all around the country, a Conference on New Towns, and the development of a model to revitalize Detroit's Woodward-Cass corridor, the area in which the University is situated. There were, however, problems due to the personality of the director and fears he engendered that the center would attempt to coordinate all urban involvement at the University. Such involvement was just too diffuse and complex to be coordinated.

The four divisions of the Center work well enough in their own spheres--community activities, research, education, and international urban studies--but they seem not to mesh well nor do they complement each other appreciably. The former director of the Center, an interesting and productive scholar in his own right, was not able to provide the administrative glue which would have held the four divisions somehow centered on common or shared goals and concerns. Consequently, the four parts tend to compete with each other in noncompetitive areas, wasting much time and energy. Separately, they do much that is admirable.

For example, the Community Activities division, under Professor Simmons, was asked to mediate the changeover of a Catholic church activities building in St. Peter Claver parish, from the jurisdiction of the Archdiocese and the parish to the United Community Services, which had, in fact, been providing most if not all of its support over the last few years. This was one of those touchy situations where the neighborhood wanted, and felt demonstrably justified, complete control of the facility, since they were the ones using it, and where the earlier style "lady bountiful" control through the parish was reluctant to let go of authority over the facility out of genuine fear for its survival and proper use. Professor Simmons provided, patiently and over a long period, negotiating opportunities and guidelines for all parties involved in the issue, and slowly but surely the group brought itself around to an agreement fully satisfactory to both sides. The measure of his success, which he claims for the University since his work was sanctioned by the University, came at the very end of the process when some of the original board members from the parish were asked, unanimously, by the community to continue as members of the newly revised and reorganized board of the parish center.

On a totally different topic, the International Urban Studies division has provided staff and leadership skills of high professional quality. Professor Jack Fisher heads the work of the American-Yugoslav Project, most of which activity takes place in Yugoslavia, not in Detroit, although Yugoslavs are almost set-pieces on the campus of Wayne. The Belgrade Transportation Study is the most ambitious of his programs. Professor Fisher is either a politically-minded academic or an academically-minded politician, no one knows which, although he has a Ph. D. and all the other traditional paraphernalia of academe, and he has persuaded broad-based support of his unusual program from a range of civic and political leadership. Judges, architects, planners, lawyers, and other professionals from the City and from around the U. S. serve on his advisory board. Part of Professor Fisher's program involves having graduate students, called Junior Fellows, from both Eastern and Western Europe--Yugoslavia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, France, England--come to Wayne for a 10-month period of study and research in the Detroit urban region. Others, who are full-fledged professionals and who are called Senior Fellows, come usually for one quarter at a time to teach special courses in urban-regional planning, or to lead seminars for graduate students at Wayne and to supervise special research projects carried on in their specialties by Wayne graduate students. This very successful program has had fiscal support from the Ford Foundation and continuous endorsement by the U. S. Department of State as well as by national governments of the countries represented.

The Urban Education division is headed by Professor Otto J. Hetzel, who holds a joint appointment in the Law School and in the Center. The "Urban Fellowship" program is the major formal educational program of the Center. Fellows can be from any school, college, or department in the University which views their work with the Center as a useful component of the entire educational experience. Fellows in 1970-71 are from all ten schools and colleges in the University, and represent more than a dozen different disciplines.

The departure, in the spring of 1970, of the Director of the Center for Urban Studies, which was in part due to his failure of leadership, has not had the effect of bringing these sections closer together. An acting director, a member of the University's central executive staff, is holding the fort until the University--and the Center-- decide what direction the Center should take from now on.

There is a fairly substantial "student involvement" aspect to the Center for Urban Studies, especially considering its primary emphasis on graduate and advanced undergraduate programs, and the students' interest and enthusiasm for what they are getting out of the several parts of the Center toward their education and future career goals certainly will be weighed heavily when determining the Center's future.